DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 810 CE 045 806

AUTHOR	Sims, Ripley S.
TITLE	An Inquiry into Correspondence Educating Processes. (Concise Version.)
INSTITUTION	International Council for Correspondence Education.
SPONS AGENCY	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris (France).
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	155p.; Research was conducted at the University of Wisconsin; results were published by ICCE via Punjabi University.
AVAILABLE FROM	International Council for Distance Education, Grant MacEwan Community College, P.O. Box 1796, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5J 2P2 ($7.50 in U.S. dollars).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Correspondence Study; Cost Effectiveness; Developing Nations; Educational Finance; *Educational Policy; *Educational Practices; *Educational Principles; *Foreign Countries; Surveys

ABSTRACT

This report is based upon an inquiry into the policies, principles, and practices in correspondence educating processes worldwide. It includes results of a survey of current reliable information and data on ongoing correspondence education processes worldwide; a survey of literature on correspondence educating processes and related subjects; and data analyses. In Part One, foundations and frames of references in the educating processes of a society are presented as the framework for the report perspective. Part Two discusses the principal processes of correspondence education. A chapter is devoted to each of seven basic questions: determining need, policymaking, planning, organizing, operating, evaluating and accrediting, and research and development. Part Three investigates the cost aspects of correspondence educating processes. Part Four is devoted to the use of communications technologies in correspondence educating processes. Appendixes include a five-page bibliography, the methodology for the inquiry, numerical information and data, and the questionnaire. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

201K

ED276810

An Inquiry Into
Correspondence Educating Processes

(Concise Version)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RIPLEY S. SIMS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

BL Snowden

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE045806

Prepared under the auspices of UNESCO in collaboration with International Council for Correspondence Education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Published 1982

International Council for Correspondence Education

under the Supervision of

Professor Bakhshish Singh
and
Dr. S. S. Bal

Directorate of Correspondence Courses,
Punjabi University, Patiala (India).

To the memory of aunt Rosalie I Singleton who reared us and whose studious and exemplary life as teacher and community leader influenced profoundly not only the future lives of her deceased sister's four young children but the lives of countless others in the community as well.

Ripley S. Sims

IMPRIMIS

This study by Dr. Ripley Sims was prepared under the auspices of UNESCO, in collaboration with the ICCE. The opinions expressed in this study are those of the author and of the institutions providing information, and are not necessarily those of UNESCO. I would like to record appreciation of the ICCE for the financial support provided by UNESCO for this project.

This book published by the International Council for Correspondence Education is an abridged edition of the study undertaken by Dr. Sims. The author has made a commendable contribution indeed to the cause of Distance education by conducting a very well-planned and systematic inquiry into the policies, principles and practices in correspondence educating processes, in different countries of the world. Against 313 questionnaires issued, Dr. Sims received 105 responses out of which 63 responses contained enough information and data which proved useful for this study. The University of Wisconsin deserves special appreciation for agreeing to serve as the research base for this project.

This book, I am sure, will provide sufficient know-how about current practices in correspondence education in various countries which could be of considerable value to the developing nations in introducing this innovative educating process in their education systems. The inquiry also provides useful information and data on trends and development in the utilisation of newer communication technologies. It should, therefore, be of equal significance to Distance educators in the advanced countries as well.

(Bakhshish Singh)
President, ICCE

PREFACE

This book is a concise version of an unpublished comprehensive inquiry into correspondence educating processes worldwide. The inquiry was made under the auspices of the International Council on Correspondence Education for UNESCO.

In this concise version, several chapters of the comprehensive typescript are omitted, together with most of the verbatim comments of respondents to the inquiry. In addition, the chapters included in this concise version are abridged considerably.

It is intended that this concise version will extend accessibility to a wide audience of interested readers.

Ripley S. Sims

AUTHOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A comprehensive inquiry of the kind from which this concise version is extracted requires the help and cooperation of many people. Even though it is not possible to include in this acknowledgement the names of all persons who aided in this inquiry, it is my purpose to give credit where it is due to those persons and institutions most closely associated with the study and its completion.

I am particularly grateful to Charles A Wedemeyer, of the University of Wisconsin, who was a constant source of encouragement, both as a sounding board and critic; to Borje Holmberg, of Fernuniversitat, West Germany, who as President of the International Council on Correspondence Education took the necessary initiatory action to get the inquiry financed by UNESCO, and who followed-up with UNESCO-ICCE coordination during the early stages of the project; and to Bakhshish Singh, of Punjabi University, India, through whose efforts as present President of ICCE this concise version is published.

A special recognition is due to UNESCO for the financial support of the inquiry.

My sincere appreciation to the educational leaders of more than sixty institutions worldwide who responded to a lengthy and searching questionnaire, with a special thanks to those leaders whose institutions I visited for research purposes. These persons were generous with their time, advice, and knowledge.

I owe a considerable debt to the administration of the University of Wisconsin for entering an agreement for the University to serve as the research base for the project. The University provided office space, access to computer operations, and special library privileges required for the completion of the inquiry.

Finally, a note of thanks and appreciation to Mrs. Jan Noyola for her efficient work over many months in typing the lengthy typescript on which this abridged version is based; and to my wife Dorothy for taking on more than her share of household responsibilities during the study.

Ripley S. Sims

CONTENTS

Page

Introductory Perspective.. 1

PART ONE : FOUNDATIONS AND FRAMES OF REFERENCES

Introduction 4

Chapter

1 Classroom and Non-Classroom Strategies...................... 4

2 A Brief Focus on Learning.. 9

3 The Educational System in Society.............................. 15

4 Education Institution Building.................................... 19

5 Cost-Benefit and Cost-Effectiveness Analysis in Education.. 27

PART TWO : PRINCIPAL PROCESSES

Introduction 33

Chapter

6 Determining Need 35

7 Policy-Making Processes.. 39

8 Planning Processes... 46

9 Organizing Processes.. 52

10 Operating Processes.. 59

11 Evaluating and Accrediting Processes.......................... 70

12 Research and Development Processes......................... 79

Explicative Synthesis.. 83

PART THREE : COSTS CONSIDERATION IN CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATING SYSTEMS

Introduction.. 85

Chapter

13 Recurrent Costs 87

PART FOUR : COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES

Introduction 96

Chapter

14 Utilization Practices.. 98
Postscript..108

BIBLIOGRAPHY.. 110

APPENDICES

A Methodology for Inquiry 115
B Numerical Information and Data 119
C Questionnaire for Inquiry.... 127

Introductory Perspective

This report is based upon an inquiry into the policies, principles, and practices in correspondence educating processes worldwide. The inquiry was made under the auspices of the International Council on Correspondence Education (ICCE), under the terms of a contract with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The methodology and terms of reference for the inquiry are set forth in Appendix A. The objective of the inquiry was twofold : (1) to provide information and data on current practices worldwide with the hope that policy-making authorities in the less industrialized nations wishing to do so could find in such practices helpful suggestions for the introduction of correspondence educating processes into their own education systems; and (2) to provide information and data on trends and developments in the utilization of newer communications technologies for a larger audience of educators with primary responsibilities for the ongoing correspondence educating processes in their institutions or societies. This twofold objective imposed upon the research designate for the inquiry the task of performing three vital operations : (1) obtaining current reliable information and data on ongoing correspondence education processes worldwide; (2) surveying the literature on correspondence educating processes and on subjects related thereto; and (3) analyzing results, and pointing up implications in a final report.

The contribution hoped for in the entire report is that at least another perspective on correspondence educating processes will be engendered in the mind of the reader. If this is accomplished, a very useful purpose will have been fulfilled.

It is a basic thesis of the inquiry that every sentient or healthful individual human being can and, more often than not, does learn in an exceedingly wide variety of learning situations, formal, informal, or nonformal; that the manner of learning is unique with the individual; that the contrived learning environment of the education system constitutes but one of the many learning opportunities afforded in the society at large; and that the more complex the society, the greater the variety of learning opportunities. Within the context of this perspective, the correspondence educating processes are integral to the total contrived educating processes of a society. Since it is integral, the scope of the correspondence educating processes is the same as that of the total educating processes in a society. This does not mean that the learning tools and subject matter in the correspondence educating processes are identical in every case to the tools and subject matter for learning in the total educating processes. Presently, this is not the case in any nation. What is meant here and throughout the report is that 'correspondence educating processes' and 'conventional educating processes' are merely convenient labels for designating different strategies for the accomplishment of the same end in view, i.e., learning by the individual human being. Education, by whatever means for whatever purpose, is for the individual human being, since only the individual can learn. This 'learning by the individual as the end in view in education' is by far the most often repeated theme throughout the report. It is the cohesive concept of the report.

The broad goals and specific objectives of education systems vary over an indescribably wide spectrum, not only from nation to nation, but also within the nations as well. It is clearly beyond the terms of references for this report to inquire into the overall educational activities of the nations involved in the study. The correspondence educating processes of a society, however, cannot be addressed meaningfully in a vacuum, since these processes are integral to the total educating processes of society. Thus, it is that the overall educational activities of the societies involved are pertinent, in order to put the report in proper contexts. In view of this, there are certain basic questions which do not surface in the report for explicit answers, but which are nevertheless implicit as the substantive source in which a report of this nature is rooted and from which it gets its meanings. For example, one such question equally applicable in every society, whatever its political, economic, social, or ideological persuasion, is typified by the one raised by Bruner [1961] : "What shall we teach and to what end ?" [p. 1]. Both the broad, long range goals and the specific, short-range objectives depend ultimately upon the answer the society gives to this type of basic question.

This and other questions in a similar vein can be answered only in terms of the underlying educational philosophy of a society; or, indeed, of the underlying philosophies, since a society may have more than one set of guiding principles for its multivariate educational activities. On a worldwide scale, educational philosophies run a gamut as wide as the diversities of human societies. While any attempt to discuss these and other basic questions is clearly beyond the scope of this inquiry, it would be foolishly unrealistic to carry on the discussions of topics pertinent to the inquiry as if the basic questions did not exist. They do exist, and the report of the inquiry is made in that context, although, as stated, the questions are not raised explicitly in the report.

This report consists of four parts. In Part One, foundations and frames of references in the educating processes of a society are presented as the framework for the report perspective.

In Part Two the principal processes of correspondence education are discussed. Part Two consists of seven chapters.

Part Three is on the cost aspects of correspondence educating processes. There is one chapter in this part.

Part Four is devoted entirely to the utilization of communications technologies in correspondence educating processes. There is one chapter in Part Four.

PART ONE

FOUNDATIONS AND FRAMES OF REFERENCES

Introduction

Part One begins with a brief consideration of the concepts of contiguous (classroom) and non-contiguous (non-classroom) teaching-learning strategies. Part One then continues with a brief focus on the learning process itself.

Attention is next focused in Part One on the machinery established by society to provide learning environments for the individual learner, i.e., on the education system. The education system is viewed as a sub-system in the societal supra-system.

Part One next turns to the means for implementing the broad goals and specific objectives of the education system, i.e., to the education institutions within the system. Actually, these institutions, although 'systems' in their own right, are sub-systems of the larger education systems. Finally, Part One ends with what may seem to some readers to be the most excursive topics of all, cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis. These topics tend to seem all the more remote because the concepts and the language are borrowed directly from business and economics. Both concepts have relevance for education, however, if for no other reason than the rising unit cost of education, coupled with a growing demand for educational opportunities worldwide. It is emphasized in the discussion that both cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit can serve useful purposes in certain aspects of educational planning and implementation.

Chapter 1

Classroom and Non-classroom Strategies

Far too often, both in the literature and in practice, the controlling attitudes and modes of thinking have resulted in an artificial separation of the learning processes by the individual human being into what may be labeled as contiguous (classroom) and non-contiguous (non-classroom) dichotomies. Part of this separation confusion may stem from the elemental fact that the learning process of the individual human being is not understood clearly at this time. This basic lack of understanding could result in mistaking the means for the end in view in educating processes.

As the label implies, the contiguous learning environments are such that the teacher and the learner are in face-to-face relation during the teaching-learning process. The non-contiguous strategies, on the other hand, provide learning environments in which the learner is separated in space and time from the teacher for much, most, or all of the time. Thus, the basic difference between the contiguous and non-contiguous learning environments is in the means of communication. In the contiguous learning environments, communication is personal and face-to-face; in the non-contiguous environments, communication may be personal and face-to-face for limited periods of time, but it is largely written, mechanical, electronic or some other means of communicating at a distance. Whatever the means of communication, the other three elements in a teaching-learning situation, namely, the learner, the teacher, and the substance for learning, are the same for both contiguous and non-contiguous learning environments.

The expression 'learning environment,' as used in this report, is an abstraction for a variety of considerations, arrangements, and processes in the teaching-learning situations. The learning environment consists of the materials, ideas, and people as sources and resources of information and data which the individual learner converts into learning. Thus, in this sense, subject matter or the substance for learning is also a means to an end.

Both contiguous and non-contiguous learning environments are contrivances to optimize, if not maximize, the learning results for the individual learner. And, the learner learns within both types of learning environments, so that there is no known reason at present to assume that one set of learning environments is generally superior to another set of learning environments. Gagne' [1965] provides the following telling statement on the assumption for learning by the individual student :

> "It is not assumed that a school building is necessarily needed, nor a set of books, nor desks, nor blackboards, nor even a teacher. Insofar as these components of the educational system are shown to be necessary because of the requirements of learning, well and good, The only thing that must be assumed is a student who is capable of learning. This is the starting point" [p. 23].

Traditionally, the contiguous (classroom) strategies for the teaching-learning process are widely known and used in human societies worldwide. These strategies, therefore, enjoy the prestige and acceptance of having been institutionalized over time. The non-contiguous (non-classroom) mode has been known also over time, dating from about the middle of the nineteenth century, but it has not been institutionalized, i.e., meaningful and valued in society, to anything like the extent of the classroom mode. It is the purpose of this chapter to highlight the non-contiguous (non-classroom) aspect as the main concern of the report. There are a variety of labels being used currently, both in the literature and in actual practice, to describe the teaching-learning contrivances in which the learner is at a distance in time and space from the teacher. The labels include among others home study, correspondence study, correspondence education, independent study, and distance education.

The label adopted for this report—correspondence educating processes—is obviously an arbitrary preference to any of the other labels being used currently for the concepts involved. Today, correspondence educating processes are not limited to written, mechanical, electronic, telephonic or other means of communication at a distance. In a growing number of nations, these processes include arrangements for periodic face-to-face contacts during the teaching-learning period. While these opportunities for face-to-face sessions are voluntary for the learner in many systems, in some systems the learner is required to participate in the meetings during the teaching-learning process.

Viewed in this way, correspondence and conventional educating processes may be used effectively to enrich, enhance, and extend the education system beyond the traditional institutional boundary. New adult learners, for example, with a wide diversity of academic, occupational, technical, professional, political, and socio-cultural needs and demands may not fit neatly or comfortably into the traditional mold of rigid curricula, 'normal' intelligence categories, or the course requirements designed for the young people of the society. The correspondence educating integral can aid in extending the learning environment to these adult learners. In addition, the correspondence educating integral provides the flexibility required by the adult learner in full-time or part-time employment.

In some societies, the practice is such that the distinction between contiguous and non-contiguous teaching-learning strategies is becoming increasingly blurred, so far as the educational ends in view are concerned. In these societies, the primary concerns are the educational needs and demands of the society. If, for example, the decision is reached that a society is 'poor because it is ignorant" then the educational concern is to reduce the ignorance of the individuals in that society by whatever means are feasible and effective for the end in view. To become overly concerned with labels, per se, would be an obvious and needless dissipation of the society's valuable human resources. For example, in certain of the rural societies where agriculture is the dominant enterprise, both contiguous and non-contiguous strategies are employed as required to produce a successful crop yield, with little or no regard for labels per se. In such societies, the outcome or end in view is a practical one, e.g., an increase in crop yield per acre.

Learning in the formal school setting, whether contiguous or non-contiguous, is facilitated for the learner when the subject matter is the selected, formulated, and organized ideas and skills acquired over time in the society, and when the subject matter is required to perpetuate and/or improve life in the society. With this direct linkage of subject matter in and out of the formal school setting, the school subjects may be employed as powerfully working resources to create learning environments which serve to stimulate and direct the learning efforts of the individual adult learner.

Thus, by providing learning opportunities for larger segments of the population, by paying attention to individual needs and capabilities, by rewarding non-formal educational acquirements, and by sensing and using the basic inseparability of subject matter and method, the new learning environments, both contiguous and non-contiguous, provide a significant forward movement towards a focus on learning by the individual human being, which is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 2

A Brief Focus on Learning

It is the process of learning by the individual human being which constitutes the core of the educating processes. As Faure, et al. observe, "Education from now on can no longer be defined in relation to a fixed content which has to be assimilated, but must be conceived of as a process in the human being . . ." [p. 143]. Thus, an essential first point is that education is a continuing process throughout the sentient life of the individual human being. An essential second point is that the educative process takes place within the nervous system of the individual human being. Gagne' [1970] puts this matter succinctly : "The site of learning is the individual's nervous system. For this fundamental unarguable reason, learning is individual. Efficient instruction is designed for the individual learner" [p. 58]. A third essential point is that individuals differ widely in abilities to learn, as is well known but sometimes overlooked. For the same course of study, individuals learn in different ways, at different rates, and achieve different outcomes. Individuals differ not only from each other in how and what they learn, but within the same individual there may be considerable variations in learning capacities for different subjects and by different modes. In some cases, the variation in capacities within an individual is greater than that between individuals. [Remmers, et al. , 1957, p. 195.]

These three points provide a backdrop for a brief focus on learning by the individual human being : Learning is a complicated process, it is individual, and it is maximized when individual differences are taken into account.

The individual learns by experiencing cerebral, visceral, muscular, and/or glandular changes of modifications in the process of acting, reacting, and interacting with the materials, people, ideas, and other resources in the learning environment. Thus, it is that in the process of learning, the intellectual, emotional, and physical aspects are experienced as an integrated whole. It is out of this integrated experience that the meanings, significances, and patterns of behavior for the learner are derived.

It is observed that the process of learning involves the way in which the individual selects, organizes, and uses the aim, method, and subject matter of the learning environment. What results from experiencing the process is called 'learning.' Thus, it is that the objective, method and subject matter are the means to the end in view i.e., acquirement by the learner of the meanings, the significance, the habits, and the attitudes from having experienced the process. However, the individual does not learn in a vacuum; learning is affected directly by the socio-cultural milieu in which the learning takes place. Thus, while there is continuing interaction between the individual learner and the means to the end in view in the learning environment, there are also other interactions with the people, things, and ideas of the society. A learning event is said to take place when, as a result of these interactions, the meaning, significance, habit, and/or attitude of the individual human being change from a time before to a time after the learning process. Further, a learning event takes place irrespective of the personal, mechanical, electronic or other means of communication in the learning environment. The learning style of one individual may differ significantly, however, from that of another.

It is readily observable that individuals differ in the amount of previous learning, or, to put it another way, in the amount of uncertainty, they bring to a new learning situation or task. Winn [1975] states that this "uncertainty . . . can be attributed to many different sources at once and can act simultaneously on many different dimensions within the individual" [p. 15]. This is viewed as the 'cognitive structure' of the individual. Not only do individuals differ in cognitive structure, but they also differ widely in the way or manner in which they approach a new learning situation cognitively. This is viewed as the cognitive style of the individual. Thus, the learners differ individually in their previous learning (cognitive structure) and in their way or manner of approach to a learning task (cognitive or learning style).

Researchers in this area of human cognition have identified at least two clear-cut cognitive styles of learning. Some individuals go about the learning process by separating out the parts from the whole of the learning task, that is, these individuals tend to 'take things apart' in getting at the meanings involved. For these individuals, the elements, parts, or attributes of the learning situation have meanings in themselves. Learners in this category can abstract information from the parts within the context of the learning situation, and resist at the same time any interfering effects of the situation as a whole. This 'taking things apart' in the process of learning is clearly in line with the Piagetian theory of the learner as being intellectually active.

In a second cognitive style identified by investigators, the learners tend to go about the learning process by viewing the learning situations as a whole, with the elements, parts, or attributes of the task 'fused' with the whole. For these learners, the learning task has meaning as a whole, not in separate parts as in the parts analysis approach.

Comparatively, then, these two learning styles are believed to be distinct, on the basis of present knowledge. In the 'analytic style' of learning, the learner tends to be highly analytical and to isolate and examine in detail aspects of the learning task, whereas in the non-analytic approach, the learner tends to experience the learning task as a whole or in a global manner. Further, the style of the analytic learner is said to require greater reflection and deeper concentration than that of the non-analytic learner. Also, a longer span is required in the analytic approach than in the non-analytic approach.

Significantly, investigators report that individuals with the same kind of intelligence may have different cognitive styles; that is to say, the manner or way in which the learner goes about or approaches the learning task (the cognitive style) is independent, reportedly, of intelligence [Cawley, et al. (1976), p. 102].

One reasonable question to ask at this juncture is this : What are the influencing factors, personal and/or cultural, which determine the ways in which learners approach the learning task ? The answers to questions in this vein on the cause and effect, if any, between the socio-cultural environment and individual cognitive style require much more evidence than is currently available. There are, however, a few observations which relate, in some cases tangentially, to the basic questions involved.

For example, with reference to culture and cognitive styles, Hovey [1971] made a study of the concomitants of cognitive style in 14 societies in Africa. His basic hypothesis was that a given characteristic in cognitive style is an important factor in learning to the extent that it is a manifestation of, or a concomitant with, a persistent and basic characteristic of the culture of the learner. He found that the cognitive style of some of these societies tended to cluster in the direction of the articulate (analytical) learning style, while others of these societies tended to cluster in the opposite direction of the global (relational) learning style. He concluded that on a theoretical level, by matching the cultural data of a society with the cognitive style paradigm of Witkin, it appears possible to identify the places of a society on the articulated global dimension. Thus, for the societies studied, Hovey found that learners in some of these societies tended to 'take things apart' as a learning style, while learners in other of these societies tended to experience elements as fused with the whole as a learning style. The Hovey findings did not include information related to cause and effect.

There are some very practical implications for both contiguous and non-contiguous teaching-learning arrangements in the findings of some of the inquiries into learning styles. For example, as a result of a comprehensive study of the literature on the cognitive styles of elementary school children, Cohen [1969] states : "A new observation that emerged from this study of the literature on cognitive styles was that . . . the overall ideology and learning environment of the school embody requirements for many social and psychological correlates of the analytic style" [p. 830]. Does this imply that the overall learning environment, whether contiguous or non-contiguous, favors the analytic learner ? Cohen continues with a suggested partial answer to this question : "Many schools related learning characteristics, such as length and intensity of attention, preferences of optional reading material, and the differential dependence upon primary groups also distinguish between these two types of individuals . . . . So discrepant are analytic and relational frames of reference that a pupil whose preferred mode of cognitive organization is emphatically relational is unlikely to be rewarded in the school setting, either socially or by grades" [Ibid., p 830]. This study by Cohen on the cognitive styles of the pre-adult learner is, in one sense, supplemented by the inquiry by Cawley, et al., cited earlier, on the adult learner. In either case, the implications for arrangements to facilitate learning are obvious. Ignorance of the learning style of the individual, and consequent failure to provide therefor, can be detrimental to the individual's learning efforts.

Brimer [1971] notes that wastage in dropouts and repeaters in education is a worldwide problem. Faure., et al. [1972] point out that fully half the children enrolled at the primary stage in half the nations of the world fail to complete the required work. And with regard to correspondence educating processes the relevant literature is replete with a recital of long-term, continuing concerns about the high rate of non-starts and/or dropouts in this integral of educating processes. With due allowance for other factors involved, to what extent, if any, is the dropout and repeater wastage in education attributable to ignorance of learning styles of learners, with consequent failure to provide therefor ? Ward [1973] raises a series of additional questions on the practical implications of planning learning environments which are sensitive to learning styles : "What are the facets or aspects of cognitive style that can be accommodated by alterations of instructional procedures and materials ? Which of these are worth accommodating (in the sense of cost-effectiveness) ? If cognitive style and learning potentialities (capabilities or tendencies) are related, how important are the differences in learning that are keyed to cognitive style ? Is cognitive style persistent, or easily altered ?" [p. 6].

Even though, as Ward points out, there is at present only "partial understanding of cognitive style and how it relates to, or is part of, or is affected by the learner's world or life view" [Op. cit., p. 5], there is enough evidence to justify thoughtful consideration of the relative importance of cognitive style in the design of learning environments, contiguous or non-contiguous. The consistency over time with which classical studies agree that it appears possible to identify the place of a human learner on a learning continuum, such as analytic-relational, suggests strongly that the time is now that arrangements to facilitate learning become and remain sensitive to the learning styles of learners. The projected trend for the future supports this view. With reference to the cognitive process of the human being, Bertalanffy writes : "It will be correct to say that it is the general trend in modern psychology and psychiatry, supported by biological insight, to recognize the active part in the cognitive process" [p. 191].

This brief focus on learning necessarily leaves more questions unanswered than are answered. The answers, as often repeated, are simply not in as yet. Even so, there are certain developments and benchmarks in regard to the processes of learning which can be helpful for the structure and design of the education system of a society. A brief look at the education system in society is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 3

The Educational System in Society

The frequency with which the expression 'educational system' is found in the literature and is used in this report warrants a brief explication on what the intentions are in using it for this inquiry. Thus, this discussion is not intended to go into the ramifications of the concept of 'educational system' per se, but rather the purpose is simply to define the use of the expression within the limited context of this report.

Basically, it is the concept of the 'system' that converts the educating processes of a society into something uniquely different from and more than a mere summation of the diverse elements involved. A 'system' functions so that the elements are classified and arranged in a regular, orderly form and are linked integratively into a composite whole. Thus, increasing use is being made of the system concept in education, and the abstraction labeled 'educational system' is important in the modern world.

Each educational system has its being, or its situate, in a supra-system, i.e., in the society in which it exists. The 'society' may be national, regional, state, provincial, local, or a combination involving these. Thus, the broad goals and aims and the specific objectives of the formalized educating processes, as do the non-formalized educating processes, derive from socio-cultural, political, economic, or ideological philosophies of the supporting groups in the society. Further, factors influencing policymaking on broad goals and specific objectives include, among others, social, physical, financial, geographical, demographic and, in today's world, the relative extent of industrialization or trend toward post-industrialization in the society concerned.

It is thus the supra-system, i.e., the society, which decides in a general but meaningful and influential way what the educational system is, what its learning environments are to be, and, to a considerable extent, what outcomes are expected from the system. It is possible, therefore, to speak meaningfully of the Danish, Russian, French, or even of the Australian or United States educational sytsems, albeit with somewhat less preciseness of the latter two than of the former three, since in Australia and the USA the separate states have autonomy in educational affairs. Thus, the abstraction 'educational system' is one means of conceptualizing the multitudinous factors involved in the extremely wide range of educating processes, and of bringing them within limitations suitable for analysis.

In each case, the educational system develops and is predicated upon indigenous considerations, problems, and concerns of the society involved. Furthermore, as stated in the World Survey of Education V [1971], "An inclusive definition (of educational system) acceptable to all countries would serve little purpose . . . . No two countries have educational systems identically composed and indeed any single system is constantly changing and growing. . . . It must be admitted, that within any country, the description of a 'unified' educational system is an abstraction" [p. 32].

Even so, there are certain minimum elements which may be employed in describing each system. Three of these elements are isolated for discussion in this report. These are the legal basis for the system, the administration of the system, and the organization of schools in the system. Each of these is discussed briefly below :

Legal Basis : Usually there is some form of legalization or legitimization of the educational system. This is particularly the case in the public sector, in which the educational system is authorized and sponsored by national, regional, state, provincial, local, and/or, in some cases, institutional authorities, The legalization or legitimization may be by constitutional or statutory provisions; by decrees, laws, or regulations; or by institutional pronouncements in rare cases. Because of the extreme differences among the human societies worldwide on the meanings and interpretations placed on even the same word or expression in the legal category, the expression 'legal basis' cannot be interpreted to have uniform meaning throughout human societies. Each such expression must be interpreted in terms of the societal context in which it is used. However, the central point here is that some form of high level authorization, based upon law and/or sanctioned by custom, exists in most societies for the educational system.

Overall Administration : As in the other aspects of educational systems, the pattern of administration is not uniform by any measure or means. As expected, the variations are not only in the degree or kind of top level administration, but there are, as well, widely varying patterns in the relative complexities of educational systems worldwide. Even so, whatever the pattern, or complexity, it is generally common practice to provide some form of overall administrative responsibility for the educational system as a whole. This is true in both industrialized and less-industrialized nations. This is the main point to be made here.

Organization : Each organizational pattern is determined to a large extent by the human society in which it exists. That these patterns vary widely needs no reiteration here. Even so, at the macro-level there is a clearly discernible similarity in the ladder-like organization of schools within the educational systems of the world. The broad categories in the ladder-like organizational structures most frequently are designated pre-school, primary or elementary, secondary, and tertiary or higher education. However, there are widely varying definitions of the meanings of each of these broad terms among educational systems worldwide, and therefore the meaning of any one of them must be understood within the context of the society in which it is used.

It should be noted that in many systems, if not in most, the organization of schools includes provisions for what is termed 'adult education.' Heretofore the usual arrangement was to provide for 'adult education' in a manner somewhat separate and distinct from the 'regular' system of education, The current trend is to include provision to integrate adult education with the total educational system. In addition, many educational systems include schools for the education of the blind, deaf and dumb, and others with physically or mentally handicapped learners.

It is evident from this brief outline of the three elements of educational systems (legal basis, administration and organization) that the diversity worldwide is such as to defy generalization, except within the context of extreme limitations. The outline of these three elements does provide, however, the backdrop needed for the discussions on correspondence educating processes in Chapters 6 through 12. The correspondence educating processes do not exist in an isolated vacuum; instead, these processes are integral with, and are therefore influenced by, the functioning of the educational system as an integrated whole.

An essential sub-system of this integrated whole is the educational institution by means of which the broad goals and specific objectives of the educational system are operationalized. Thus, it is the educational institution which is responsible for the creation and conduct of the learning environments in the system, and attention is given next to the complex subject of institution building.

Chapter 4

Education Institution Building

Perhaps the most visible sub-system of an educational system is the school or, more generally, the education institution established to operationalize the educational broad goals and specific objectives of the society. Indeed, the suitability and acceptability of the educational system as a whole may be judged, frequently, on the basis of the effectiveness and efficiency of the educational institution in meeting the demands and needs of the society.

Although the education institution is characterized by a degree of permanence and stability, it is not a fixed, inflexible organization. As Schramm [1967] comments, ". . . institutions are, ideally and in fact, dynamic processes and not just fixed structures . . . . The danger is that at times we do forget this basic fact and begin to think that the objective of institution building should be to make all the roles within it perform in such definite and precise fashions as to produce a stable and relatively rigid structure" [in Lerner and Schramm, p. 47].

After a considerable search of the literature for a point of view useful for the limited purposes of this report, the framework for institution building first conceptualized by Esman, et al., was selected. This framework by Esman, et al., is explicated in considerable detail in a source book on the subject by Melvin G. Blase [1973]. What follows in the remainder of this chapter is structured principally on the Blase source book and on the reference cited therein.

Basically, the referents for institution building in any society are the attitudes, ideas, or even ideals which are meaningful and valued in the society. Out of these and other dominant states of mind there emerges in the society certain purposes, broad goals, and specific objectives for education. In pursuit of these purposes, goals, and objectives, the society, or a private or other agency, establishes the required educating processes in the society. The establishment of these educating processes involves concomitant considerations, problems, and arrangements. This sequence of events may be viewed as outlining the essential concerns of building an education institution in a society. The required supportive values, norms, processes, and structures of the environment must be 'institutionalized' through organization in the society.

The Esman approach assumes that " . . . institution building is a generic social process," identifiable by "a set of elements and actions . . . relevant to institution building in general" [Ibid., p. 5]. It is to aspects of these 'elements and actions relevant to institution building in general' that attention is directed principally in this brief discussion of the subject in this report.

A discussion is required of the five elements thought to be involved in building a systemically sound, stable, and reliable institution. These five elements—leadership, doctrine, program, resources, and internal structure—are discussed in the order given in the remaining pages of this chapter.

The Leadership : The leadership for institution building includes not only those persons directly responsible for the direction and operation of an institution, but includes as well all others in the educational system and in the society who participate in "planning' structuring, and/or guidance of it" [Ibid., p. 6]. The leadership thus includes several varieties of competences : educational, political, organizational, administrative, and technical, as well as any religious, ideological, and other influential elements in the socio-cultural matrix. In the words of Hans C. Blaise, "Leadership is without doubt the critical variable in institution building. Even if all other variables are positive and all other conditions for institution building fufilled, institution building will not be effective unless the value of the leadership variable and its component elements are positive" [Quoted, Ibid., p. 32].

An essential ingredient for institution building is personal conviction within the leadership unit. Surveys, comparative education studies, models, case studies, and so on do not build an institution.

To the extent that such activities help in conceptualization and procedural matters, well and good. In the final analysis and synthesis, however, only people with the conviction and the will to act build an institution. As is noted in the MacKenzie, et al. [1975] publication, "The (Open) University . . . had its origin in . . . personal conviction, and not in any . . . survey of educational needs . . . ." [p. 326].

With specific reference to an educational institution, the leadership consists of all persons or groups of persons who take the lead and perform with personal conviction the actions necessary to initiate and build a new major concept into an existing educational institution, or to originate and follow through with educational institution building from the beginnings. The leadership for the educational institution marshals the required competencies, is sensitive to influential socio-cultural and political norms in the society, has a sound understanding of the societal and academic needs and values, and is realistic about the financial and other constraints on innovative ideas and proposals. The leadership is not only persistent; it is patiently so, since institution building is a 'complex, time consuming undertaking.' Wherever possible, the leadership would choose to innovate within an ongoing educational institution, in preference to starting an educational institution building process from the beginning.

The Doctrine : The doctrine provides the carefully worked out statement which, when viewed as a whole, constitutes the reference point for all the other qualities, relationships, and categories of action in the institution building process. This key role in institution building requires that the doctrine be of sufficient specificity to obtain authority to operate, but that it may not be so specific that program development is jeopardized. The doctrine requires input both from persons directly responsible for the direction of the institution and from others who participate in the planning and guidance aspects, including in some cases technical assistant teams from outside the society concerned. All such persons functioning as a cohesive unit make up the human resources for the doctrine.

The doctrine must be realistic in terms of needs and resources; it must be specific and consistent, and it must articulate clearly the foundation for action in a given situation; it must be sensitive to the preferences, priorities, goals, and targets of society; it must conform to the expected and sanctioned behavior of society; it must provide for conflict of management; and it must provide for innovative activities [Blase, p. 42, p. 61].

The doctrine in final form can be a formidable or, in some cases, even a potentially threatening document. The title of the document may serve to engender opposition to its implementation, particularly by persons whose economic and professional status, or political, ideological, and socio-cultural beliefs appear to be put in jeopardy.

With specific reference to an education institution, the doctrine sets forth in a clear, complete and concise statement the raison d'etre for initiating education institution building. The doctrine specifies the role or function of the education institution in terms of the mission to be accomplished, the purpose and outcomes expected and aimed for, the target populations, and the relationships with other education institutions, organizations, or agencies in the society. In addition, the doctrine for education institution building must reflect sensitivity to socio-cultural and political norms and values, take realistic note of financial and other constraints and limitations, and express either explicitly or implicitly commitment to human growth and development, The doctrine for educational institution building must be altered from time to time to accord with changing educational needs and priorities.

The Program : The program of an institution includes those actions, materials, and methodologies by means of which the institution performs the functions and provides the services to achieve the aims and objectives intended. It is, in fact, the instrumentation of the plans and purposes as expressed in the doctrine of the institution. It is essential, therefore, for the program to be consistent with the provisions in the doctrine. In addition, the program must be consistent with available resources; it must have visibility; it must have stability and reliability in terms of societal values, needs, and concerns; and it must possess the commitment of staff personnel for the ends in view.

At any given time, the program reflects the priorities for the achievement of institutional goals. This does not mean that every provision expressed in the doctrine can be translated into the practical activities of the institution all at once. Constraints may be imposed by circumstances either within or outside the institution. For example, constraints as set by the scarcity of resources may require gradualism in phasing in some of the desired activities. Thus, it is that the program is not a fixed and final set of activities. It is rather a dynamic working arrangement for the translation of doctrine into practicality, while remaining sensitive to and fluctuating with the requirements of society as expressed by the doctrine.

With specific reference to an educational institution, the program carries out the educational intentions and purposes delineated in the doctrine. The program thus functions to produce and deliver graduates of the education, in keeping with the educational ends in view. The educational program must be consistent with doctrinal stipulations and with resources available. It must have stability and reliability, and, at the same time, remain flexible to shift with changes in doctrinal and/or societal educational requirements. The program of an education institution requires visibility, and it must have commitment of professional, staff, and technical personnel.

Resources: Resources are, of course, the crucial factor in institution building. Decision-making on leadership, doctrine, and program is influenced by the sources available and the ability to obtain required resources through the sources.

Resources may include both quantitative and qualitative assets, as well as certain intangible but nonetheless essential benefits, derived from legal or political authority, and from information about the attitudes, values, and commitments in the society. Quantitative resources are the physical and financial assets of the institution. Qualitative resources are the informational, professional, and technical assets available to the educational institution. While adequate financial aid must be available to sustain a program, it is not required in each case that complete indigenous financial support be available initially. Such complete support can be generated by the establishment of a demand within the society for the services and/or products of the newly developed institution. A most visible bit of evidence on the worthwhileness of an educational institution would be, of course, the contributions of its graduates to the general well being and progress of the society.

With special reference to an educational institution, the resources are crucial and they may include both quantitative or qualitative assets. Quantitatively, resources for an educational institution include, among others, indigenous financial aid and foreign financial assistance; physical facilities; and communications technologies (hardware). Qualitatively, the resources for an educational institution include leadership; teaching and technical staff qualifications; library arrangements; and communications technologies (software). The crucial nature of the resources element frequently results in the educational leadership spending much of its time on the availability of resources and the sources through which the resources can be obtained. Leadership, doctrine, and program are influenced directly by the availability of resources for the educational institution.

Internal Structure : This category of institution building relates to the infrastructure of the institution as an organization.

The infrastructure of the institution affects and is affected by the socio-cultural and political environment external to it. The identification of external participants, consistency with doctrine, and adaptability of programs to shifting emphases and changes to meet societal needs and demands are all considerations for the institution's infrastructural policies.

With specific reference to an educational institution, the infrastructure for education institution building results from actions taken internally to plan, organize, staff, direct and control the institution to achieve the educational ends in view. In the process, distribution of authority and decision-making mechanisms are established; lines of communication are clarified; and the means of guiding and controlling overall operations are instituted. The needed relations of the infrastructure of the education institution with the external environment are established, staffed, and maintained.

This briefly outlined perspective on institution building in the above paragraphs suggests that the process of institution building is considerably more than the re-arrangement or re-organization of administrative structures. Thus, an educational organization is 'institutionalized' through interactions in and among relevant groups for whom, over time, the educational organization becomes meaningful and valued in the society. Institutionality, then, is a human phenomenon which results from an organization that meets successfully the hopes and aspirations of the people being served, and thus becomes valued. Institutionality is not only a matter of what professional educators think; it involves also what teachers, politicians, and people in general accept, expect, and reward. In an educational institution, institutionality is also a matter of what the learners think [Ibid., p. 279].

As noted earlier, however, the end-state of institution building, i.e., institutionalization, is not a fixed entity, but rather is a complex of roles that develop in spontaneous processes. Not only is the process of institutionalizing an essential ingredient of institution building, but the need for de-institutionalizing may be required to achieve desired educational purposes. As Hanson comments, "One of the most unfortunate residues from colonialism in developing nations is the fact that colonial institutions often come to be valued for their own sakes, to be seen as having some intrinsic value which raised them above the challenge of assessment in terms of their usefulness in fulfilling social purposes. Once an institution is so viewed, attempts to alter it become singularly difficult. The near-mystical sense of intrinsic value which has been generated precludes a call upon rational bases for change, and outmoded institutions remain as barriers to development. The important ingredient in the 'institutionality' sought for development purposes is that the organization, while retaining its own identity, not lose its capacity to adapt to changing circumstances . . ." [Quoted, Ibid., p. 279].

The education institution occupies, normally, a place of high visibility in the society. Further, as Faure, et al., point out, "The expansion of education has required and will continue to require a massive increase in spending" [Op. cit., p. 40]. But, obviously, such "massive increase in spending" does not and cannot go on without limit, or without increasing a concern for the benefits to be derived from such expenditure. For many nations today, including not only most of the less industrialized but some of the more affluent nations as well, the expenditures on education already are stretched to the limit, and the squeeze is on to restrict expenditures within specified budgetary limits. As Beeby [1969] states it, "Education systems everywhere today are trapped in an economic squeeze which promises to get progressively worser. The squeeze is coming in one direction from the slow-down in the rapid rate at which educational expenditures have been rising in recent years and in the other direction from an inexorable rise in the unit cost of education" [p. 25]. And, as Faure, et al., observed, "We must decide what proportion of the additional increment should be used to develop and perfect formal school establishments and what amount should be allocated to other needs . . . ." [Op. cit., p. 45]. Thus, decision-makers on educational planning today are more and more concerned with such questions as those related to cost/benefits and cost/effectiveness of educational programs and strategies. In the next and final chapter on the frame of reference within which correspondence educating processes must be discussed, attention is given to selected aspects of cost/benefits and cost/effectiveness analysis in education.

Chapter 5

Cost-Benefit and Cost-Effectiveness Analysis in Education

In the traditional sense, for both educators and the general public, the 'image' of the educational system usually consists of all the formal educational institutions within the system. Further, the 'output' of the constituent institution is looked upon generally in non-quantitative terms, i.e., education is regarded as a means for the individual to acquire meanings, significances, habits, and attitudes of positive value and good in the society. Essentially, these are qualitative outcomes of the educating processes. With increasing frequency, however, one encounters a more quantitatively oriented body of literature in regard to the costs and benefits of education. The language in this body of literature is largely that of economists who produce much if not most of it.

Without indulging in the purely technical language of the economists, the distinction between the two expressions most frequently encountered in the literature is that (1) cost-benefit analysis of education focuses strongly on the measurable economic benefits, whereas (2) cost- effectiveness analysis focuses on a variety of non-economic objectives of education. It is this distinction that characterizes what follows in this chapter on the techniques of cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis in education.

Basically, both cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis are useful tools for educational administration. A prime objective of these tools is to aid in decision-making processes which aim to maximize the returns on a given amount of resources allocated to education, or, to view it from another perspective, the aim is to minimize the cost of a prescribed level of educational outcomes. However, the basic purpose as stated is more idealistic than realistic at present. It is one thing to wish to make decisions that maximize output for a given cost or, conversely, minimize the costs for a given output; however, it is quite a different thing to do this in an area as difficult to measure inputs and outputs as in education.

The cost-benefit analysis provides useful information based on small or marginal investment; it does not, however, provide information for large-scale expansion of educational facilities.

It is pertinent to set forth the steps involved in the analysis. Ideally, the steps in analysis may include the following : (1) Defining the objective or set of objectives; (2) costing out the various alternative investment opportunities; (3) determining the benefits of the alternative investment opportunities in relation to costs; and (4) judging, intuitively and objectively, which alternative, if any, to select. Quite obviously, it is beyond the purpose of this overview to employ the outside expertise required for a detailed follow-through discussion on each of these analytical steps. What is done in the following pages is to outline briefly the question of objectives, and then to point up certain of the procedures of cost-benefit analysis and of cost-effectiveness analysis as applied to education. For, as Blaug suggests, "Education falls uneasily between the two stools of cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness" [OCED, Paris, 1968, p. 176].

Objectives in Education : The essential first step for cost-benefit analysis (and for cost-effectiveness analysis, too) is a clear specification of the objective or set of objectives in view, even though some of the objectives cannot be considered an economic investment in the sense that they will later result in an increase in national income. Further, the setting of objectives must be a policy matter, based upon the combined competences of the educational leadership at all levels in the system concerned. In a very real sense, the learner progresses through the main structural features of the educational system from level to level and branch to branch. Ideally, then, the goals and objectives should provide the iterative, integrative, yet flexible framework for this progression to be as continuous, smooth, and measurable as possible. But, as the literature also attests, the objectives of education are sometimes stated in rather 'fuzzy' terminology. On the other hand, the cost-benefit analysis technique requires that the objective in view be stated as clearly as possible, even though the means of achieving the objective may involve several possible variants, each requiring separate evaluation. Thus, the professional in educational planning must work within the limitation imposed on the one hand by the frequent absence of clearly stated educational objectives and on the other hand by the demand of cost-benefit analysis techniques for educational objectives carefully prepared in clear, specific and *measurable* terms. It is within the context of this limitation that cost-benefit analysis and cost-effectiveness analysis are discussed as separate, but complementary, techniques in the following pages.

Cost-Benefit Analysis Technique : After the goals and objectives are stated, the next step in a general systems procedure is to search for the most acceptable alternative for accomplishment of these educational goals and objectives. The cost-benefit analysis technique is one of a number of tools available to the decision-maker in this search. Thus, the cost-benefit analysis technique gives rise to certain basic questions of particular interest to the decision-maker in education. Froomkin puts some of these questions in easily understandable terms : "How much will the production of goods and services in a country increase if more is spent on education ? How much more can a person be expected to earn if he graduates from high school as contrasted with grade school; college as contrasted with high school, etc ?" [OECD, 1968, p. 202].

The cost-benefit analysis tool does not provide definitive answers to these and other pertinent questions faced by the decision-maker in education. While there is very little disagreement in the literature on the statement that investment in education does produce significant economic benefits, there is much less general agreement on the measurement of these benefits for decision-making purposes on investment in education. Even certain of the economic benefits may be difficult to quantify.

From the perspective of investment in education, the measurement of cost involves much more than the expenditures on education, usually noted in line items of a formal budget document. To be sure, one type of cost is the line item expenditures by the society : expenditures on teachers' salaries, buildings, and equipment, books and services, imputed rent, etc. Another type of cost is the earnings forgone by teachers, students, and others in the educational system. Teachers and students engaged in teaching and learning are forgoing the opportunity to be employed otherwise in the society.

Still another type of cost is the investment in education, per se, vis-a-vis investment in some other enterprise of the society, e. g., investment in modern farm equipment for farmers of the society. The decision to invest a sizable proportion of the society's human and financial resources in education requires that the society forgo the opportunity to invest in other societal needs or requirements. Thus, this, too, is an opportunity cost of education.

A final type of measurable cost is the expense borne directly by the student. Up to the legal school-leaving age, fees, books, etc. may be a matter of public expense. [In some nations, of course, the public supports the education of the student, at least to an appreciable extent, throughout the secondary and higher levels.] If the expense of staying in school after the legal school-leaving age is not borne by the public, then the cost is the responsibility of the student. This cost is in addition to the earnings forgone by the student, as discussed above.

Thus, it is that education involves several types of cost, some of which are measurable and others which defy quantification.

The majority opinion expressed in the literature suggests that the cost-benefit analysis approach can aid, not by supplying all the answers, but by pointing the direction in which further critical thinking is required. With all the shortcomings acknowledged, it is maintained, nevertheless, that cost-benefit analysis does focus the attention of the educational decision-maker on the effects on earnings of small or marginal investments in education, and that in so doing it thereby, in Blaug's [1967] words, "...forces the educational planner to face the severe limitations in his capacity to foresee the consequences of present action, particularly when action involves, as it so often does, the unprecedented expansion of educational facilities or changes in the entire structure of the educational system" [*Op. cit.*, p. 269].

While cost-benefit analysis provides one means of estimating future income benefits in terms of the costs that must be incurred in the present, the technique does not provide for the assessment of non-economic benefits, as noted earlier. On the other hand, it is well known to every person knowledgeable about education that both economic and non-economic benefits derive from the educating processes. Thus, it is that another means for assessing future non-economic or indirect benefits in terms of costs is required, i. e., cost-effectiveness analysis.

Cost-effectiveness Analysis Technique : In a fundamental way, cost-effectiveness analysis is an aspect of cost-benefit analysis. If an educational project is effective for the purposes intended it is beneficial to those concerned. However, for the purposes of this report, cost-effectiveness analysis is interpreted to denote a means for comparing the relative costs and effectiveness of different strategies for the achievement of a particular objective or set of objectives, without any distinct emphasis on economic benefits.

Cost-effectiveness analysis, therefore, provides an additional aid for the educational decision-maker in evaluating and making a cost-benefit choice between alternative strategies for the achievement of clearly stated educational objectives. There are two basic approaches identified in the literature for making the analysis : (1) Evaluate the *costs* of alternative strategies against a fixed-effectiveness level; and (2) evaluate the *effectiveness* of alternative strategies against a fixed-cost level. Each of these approaches is discussed briefly below :

When the different costs of alternative strategies are evaluated against a fixed-effectiveness level, each alternative strategy fulfils the objective to the same level of effectiveness. The relative costs of the alternative strategies can be compared and the least costly alternative determined. While this does not mean, necessarily, that the least costly alternative will be selected, it does mean that the educational decision-maker has an added bit of objective information as an aid to the ultimate 'subjective' decision-making process.

When the different levels of effectiveness of alternative strategies are evaluated against a fixed-cost level, each alternative strategy is held to the same cost. The relative effectiveness of the alternative strategies can be compared and the most effective strategy for the fixed cost can be determined. As in the reverse process above, this does not mean that the most effective strategy determined by this procedure should be selected. It is simply another bit of objective information for use by the decision-maker.

Quite obviously, it is not always possible to measure 'effectiveness' on the uni-dimensional basis required for these two analytical approaches.

Furthermore, it is frequently the case that a part but not the entire 'effectiveness' of the outcomes of education can be measured. These and other shortcomings are noted throughout the literature on the measures of effectiveness in education. In addition, because there are different kinds of 'costs' (see earlier section on costs), and because costs are payable at different times, it is not even possible to measure all costs with the precision required for cost-effectiveness analysis purposes.

Nevertheless, there are certain educational outcomes which are measurable, however crude or incomplete the measurements may be. To reason otherwise would constitute an admission of not knowing where education is going and, more to the point, of not knowing where it is when it gets there.

In particular, cost-benefit analysis can provide an added bit of objective information on the internal rate of return for small or marginal investments in education; and cost-effectiveness analysis can provide an added bit of objective information related to making a choice between alternative strategies for the achievement of objectives clearly stated. Within these limitations, the difficulties and constraints in the application of these techniques do not nullify their usefulness to the educational decision-maker in serious search of helpful, objective information and data as aids for action. However, in the final analysis, decision-making at the authorization level depends ultimately upon the intuition and judgment of the educational leaders in the society, since these basic policy questions involve values of the society as well as the results of analytical procedures.

PART TWO

PRINCIPAL PROCESSES

Introduction

In Part Two of this report, attention shifts from the foundations of educating processes as the general frame of reference to a more narrowly focused discussion of the correspondence educating processes per se. However, the chapters in this part, as well as in Parts Three and Four to follow, draw freely upon and refer to the foundational chapters of Part One. In this way, there is a continuing linkage throughout the report with the broad frames of references provided by Part One. It is essential that this be done, so that the present narrow focus on the correspondence educating processes integral is against the background of the larger, integrated system of educating processes. Furthermore, since this report attempts to be learner-centered so far as feasible, the linkage with the chapters of Part One is especially relevant for much of the discussion on the correspondence educating processes integral, particularly with topics discussed in Chapter 2.

In the conventional or residential set of teaching-learning strategies, as noted in Chapter 1, a learner and a teacher are in face-to-face contact, and the means of communication is, therefore, direct. However, an inherent assumption of the correspondence group of teaching-learning strategies is that the learner will be at a physical distance from the teacher, for part, most, or even all of the time. Therefore, provision for communication over the distance between a learner and a teacher is a distinguishing characteristic of the correspondence group of strategies. Thus, it is the means of communication that is characteristically unique about the correspondence group of strategies. In all the three other elements, the correspondence group of teaching-learning strategies do not differ inherently from other strategies in on-going educating processes.

For purposes of this report, the phraseology *correspondence* *educating processes* is used as an arbitrary preference to any of a plethora of other labels being used currently for the concepts involved. This phraseology has three advantages to this report : It denotes the separation of the learner from the teacher in teaching-learning situations ; it integrates correspondence with mainstream educating processes ; and it connotes the dynamic, as opposed to the static, qualities involved.

In order to present the widely diversified comments of respondents to the inquiry in an easily understandable format, each chapter in Parts Two through Four of the report covers only one key or basic question of the inquiry. Thus, Chapter 6 covers the key question of determining need. Chapter 7 covers the basic question on policy-making, Chapter 8 covers planning, and so on. To offset somewhat the stereotypic presentation that might result from this approach, varieties of statements from respondents' replies are included in the chapters.

Before reading through a chapter, it will be helpful to review the section of the questionnaire (Appendix C) related to the chapter.

Chapter 6

Determining Need

The key or basic question in the inquiry from which the subject of this chapter is abstracted is this : What were the stages of initiation, growth, and development of the correspondence educating processes ? The purpose of the question is to obtain background information and data on the ways in which correspondence educating processes get started, grow, and develop. The key question is followed by a series of supplementary questions designed to assist and encourage respondents to provide details both on the growth of and on major changes required in correspondence educating processes.

However, it is not to be expected that there is a uniform pattern in the initiation and growth of correspondence educating processes, for there is not. Nor is it correct to conclude that there is such a thing as the correspondence educating process, for there is not. In summation, what does exist is an all but bewilderingly great range of processes, which reflects the fact that the purposes in initiating and developing correspondence educating processes vary as widely as the human societies themselves. Thus, it is that the cross-section of respondents' statements on initiating and developing correspondence educating processes provide only a backdrop of ideas, out of which it may be possible to 'tailor-make' whatever functionality is required in a given society.

It is evident that a wide range of societal, educational, economic, demographic, geographic, and other factors influenced the initiation of the correspondence education processes in human societies. As is frequently the case in the human condition, changes occur over time so that the initial plans and purposes are revised or modified to keep pace with emerging or developing need and demands of individuals and of societies. The correspondence educating processes are no exception to this basic fact of human behavior. The comments on growth and development of correspondence educating processes are indicative of the uneven, and sometimes unsteady, expansion of initial concepts and purposes.

The verbatim comments of respondents indicate not only the diversity of beginnings and growth of correspondence education processes, but they emphasize as well the adjunct nature of most of these processes. It is also clear from the comments that many of the beginnings of correspondence educating processes were both small and limited in scope. And, as noted earlier, variation in initiatory actions and in growth seems to be the most common characteristic. Even so, there are certain aspects of the beginnings and growth which provide at least a partial basis for some general observations.

First, in most cases, even where the beginnings were small and the needs uncertain, there was a gradual growth and development as the tangible benefits of the processes were experienced in the society. This is particularly noticeable among institutions in which vocationally oriented offerings are provided for learners who are in full-or part-time employment. This appears to be true for both publicly supported and privately sponsored programs.

Second, it is noted that most of the correspondence educating processes began under conditions of extremely limited financial arrangements. In most societies, government subsidy is provided normally for learners in a residential or contiguous situation (at least up to school-leaving age and in some societies even beyond that). However, except for a certain few societies, government subsidy is not provided equitably for learners in a non-residential or non-contiguous situation. Thus, in a few cases correspondence educating processes were started without any initial government funding, and in other cases, even today, the provision of learning opportunities for non-residential or non-contiguous learners is required to be 'self-supporting', even in government supported institutions.

Third, the development pattern of correspondence educating processes represented in the respondents' statements is not one of a smooth, steady or linear growth in either curricula or acceptance.

Instead, with rare exceptions, it is one of unsystematic and at times even uncertain development, with curricula matters frequently uncoordinated and general acceptance in the academic community hanging in the balance.

In summation, each society will do what it can and must in keeping with what it has or can get to determine and meet the educational needs of the society and of learners in the society. In doing this, the responsible educational leadership may find it helpful to know of the experiences of other societies, and of their assumptions and methods in determining and meeting educational needs. For it is now becoming increasingly clear that "It is not systems which are capable of transfer so much as assumptions and methods" [MacKenzie, *et al.*, 1975, p. 91].

The assumptions and methods set forth in Chapter 4 of this report on institution building appear applicable also in the initiation, growth, and development of a system of correspondence educating processes. As pointed out in Chapter 4, leadership is the essential element, for without this element institution building of whatever nature—residential or correspondence—does not take place. A second element is the doctrine, in which is set forth in clear, unambiguous terms the raison detre of correspondence educating processes. A third element is the program, i.e., the means through which the aims and objectives required by the doctrine are carried out. A fourth element is the resources, i. e., the availability of both qualitative and quantitative sustained support for the program. A fifth and final element is the internal structure, i.e., the structure and process of relation action patterns within the institution as a dynamically functioning organizational unit. [See again Chapter 4 on the analysis of institution building.]

Thus, it appears that building a system of correspondence educating processes parallels, in many respects, the building of other types of institutional configurations. Initially, certain values and goals are visualized, and efforts are made to develop strategies to achieve them. Next, an attempt is made to overcome resistances, and to acquire the necessary authority and support to institutionalize the concepts of correspondence educating processes. After this is accomplished, the subsequent life cycle of the institutionalized concepts may progress from acceptance to normality, from entrenchment to rigidity, unless, of course, necessary actions are taken as required during the life cycle to offset this possible progression toward rigidity.

In the final synthesis, institutionalized correspondence educating processes, like any other viable institution, must function dynamically as an organic unit. To do this, it is required from the outset that certain overall judgments be made available as the basis for decision-making in attaining the desired goals and objectives via correspondence educating processes. These overall judgments for decision-making purposes may be viewed as the educational policies, and Chapter 7, following, focuses attention on policy-making processes for correspondence educating strategies.

Chapter 7

Policy-Making Processes

The educational policies in a society derive, basically, from the system of values, political options, traditions, conceptions of the future, and other situational factors in the society. Thus, the expression of a judgment or policy on education is normally the end of the sifting and winnowing thought processes in terms of the meaningful values of the society. From this, it is clearly obvious and widely recognized that the drafting of educational judgments or policies for a human society is a complex process, involving, as it does, an exceedingly wide variety of considerations and concerns in the society. Because educational policies vary as widely as human societies themselves, it would serve little or no purpose to attempt any recital in detail of the varieties of educational policies encountered in an inquiry of this scope. Suffice it to say, here again, the ideal type for across-the-nations usage does not appear to exist. What is ideal in a decentralized educational system, for example, is pure anathema to a highly centralized system, and vice versa.

In view of the variegated nature of educational policies worldwide, this inquiry did not set out to obtain and tabulate what the operating policies are for correspondence educating processes worldwide. As a general rule, such operating policies are set fourth in a great variety of prospectuses, catalogues, bulletins, and similar publications of the institutions or agencies. Instead of concentrating on *what* operating policies exist for correspondence educating processes, this inquiry undertook the task of trying to learn *how* policies are formulated and how they function as overall guidelines for correspondence educating processes. Thus, the inquiry attempted to shift the emphasis from the codified policy statements in institutional or agency publications to the dynamics of policy-making processes for correspondence educating strategies.

This shift in emphasis is indicated by the basic question on policy-making put to prospective respondents: What is the policy-making machinery for your correspondence educating processes? This question was intended to elicit the dynamics of policy-making processes, so that certain of the underlying principles involved might be discerned and possibly abstracted for inclusion in the report. However, it was realized from the outset that this is a more difficult task than that of the customary recital of policy statements on enrollment requirements, costs, completion requirements, academic 'credits', etc. from prospectuses and catalogues. The objective of the question, as suggested before, was to obtain information on the patterns of policy-making for correspondence educating processes, whether private or public, centralized or decentralized. Such patterns, if in existence, would be most useful for decision-making purposes concerning correspondence educating processes in a society. However, the responses reflected the inherent difficulty of the question. Some respondents simply did not know all aspects of policy-making processes in their systems.

The response to a series 'yes' and 'no' type questions following the basic question provide some insight into the wide variety of policy-making patterns of the respondents. More than half (52%) of the respondents have a legal, legislative or other legitimizing provision for their correspondence educating processes. However, about two-fifths (42%) do not have any clear-cut legitimization in the sense of the question asked. About six percent did not respond to this subquestion.

Almost three-fourths (73%) of the total number of respondents are in a publicly supported correspondence educating system, and about one-fifth (22%) are in a privately sponsored system. Approximately five percent of the respondents are in a proprietary, church affiliated, or other comparable system. Thus, it is that the results of this inquiry are weighted heavily on the publicly supported correspondence educating systems. In the policy-making processes, there exists only minimal interrelations between publicly and privately supported correspondence educating processes. The notable exceptions are those human societies in which privately supported systems are legally regulated by public law.

Ninety percent of the respondents from public systems indicated that no interrelations exist with private systems, and seventy percent of the private systems indicated that they do not have interrelations with the publicly supported systems. However, since only twenty-two percent of the respondents were from private systems, the results of this inquiry should be checked carefully with results of other inquiries embracing a larger percentage of private correspondence educating systems.

Seventy-two percent of the total number of respondents indicated that the policy-making machinery is related to or integrated with the policy-making machinery of a larger system, e.g. , a residential system of education. Twenty-six percent indicated that there is no relationship with any larger system. Two percent did not respond to this subquestion. By far, the largest proportion of integrated policy-making patterns is among the tertiary or university sponsored correspondence education systems.

Almost seventy percent (68% to be exact) of the total number of respondents indicated that there is a person or a group of persons within the correspondence educating system with prime responsibility to advise and/or formulate recommendations to top-level policy-making bodies concerned with correspondence educating processes. Thirty-two percent indicate that no such arrangement as this exists.

In response to a closely related subquestion, the respondents are split down the middle, fifty percent to fifty percent, on whether or not there are provisions for formally organized consultation among persons *within* correspondence education for policy-making decisions on correspondence educating processes.

Significantly, only sixty percent of the total number of respondents indicated that they have clear, unambiguous overall policy statements on the functions of the correspondence educating processes, and on the services to be provided. Forty percent of the respondents indicated that they have no such clear, overall policy statements on the functions and services of correspondence educating processes. The principles on the need for clarity of mission or role are discussed in Chapter 4 of this report.

The comments on policy-making processes provide the basis for certain types of generalization of interest to policy decision-makers. For example, as would be expected and as noted earlier, patterns of policy-making processes vary markedly, not only between centralized and decentralized systems, but they vary within these systems as well. In general, then, it appears that policy-making patterns are determined by educational considerations which may, in some cases, supersede the centralized or decentralized nature of the system.

As another example, privately sponsored and publicly supported educating systems follow, as a general rule, different paths in the policy-making processes. Quite obviously, the presidents, controllers, education directors, directors of marketing and business consultants of a privately (commercially) sponsored educational enterprise have policy-making guidelines different from those of administrators and educationists in a publicly supported educating system. Here again, however, no uniformity is found either within the public or private sectors as regards policy-making patterns.

As a final example, human societies are exceedingly variegated in their stages of 'development', and they require, therefore, different policy-making patterns for their educating processes. For example, policy-making patterns related to illiteracy or elementary education, and for some, related even to secondary education, are not of primary concern for most highly industrialized nations. The major concern in many such nations at present is with policy-making patterns related to post-secondary education, and to such questions as 'what should be taught', 'to what end', and 'in what manner'. On the other hand, a fundamental educational concern of many less-industrialized nations is to employ policy-making patterns related to reducing illiteracy and/or achieving universal primary or elementary education. Thus, policy-making patterns vary, on a broad scale, in accordance with the stages of development of nations, as well as in keeping with the level of general educational achievement within each nation.

It seems reasonable to state that, in general, the nature and scope of problems and concerns in a nation determine not only what its ultimate policy judgments will be, but determine as well, in a large measure, the patterns of policy-making processes. From this it follows that each society must "tailor-make" its own functionality in this as in other areas, based upon its problems and priorities. However, certain types of general criteria which can aid in the formation of policy judgments are indicated by the responses to this inquiry and by a review of the relevant literature. Together they constitute only one of a variety of means whereby policy judgments are formed. The criteria presented below are neither exhaustive nor definitive, they are merely indicative. The criteria are grouped into two categories as follows : 'category one', which includes criteria related to the establishment or inauguration of correspondence educating processes, and 'category two', which includes criteria related to the integration of correspondence with mainstream educating processes. Obviously, these two categories are not mutually exclusive, and there is some necessary over-lapping of ideas among the two sets of analytical statements.

With regard to criteria for the establishment of correspondence educating processes, it is required, first, that the statement on establishment describe clearly and with conviction the unique role or function of correspondence educating processes in contributing to the society's or institution's broad goals and specific objectives. The statement should include societal, institutional, and/or individual expected outcomes of correspondence educating processes, with latitude, of course, for dynamic exploration of new possibilities for services.

Second, it is required that some form of legitimization of correspondence educating processes be authorized. This may be authorized legally, legislatively, institutionally or otherwise, dependent upon the meaningful value judgments within the society. Such legitimization not only provides a firm basis upon which to operate, but it indicates as well a definite commitment of the government or other agency to the creation and sustained support of correspondence educating processes in the society.

Third, it is required that different types of professional and technical competencies be involved in the establishment of correspondence educating processes. The competencies are to include potential user group representation as well as professionals from conventional educating processes. The specialized competencies of expatriates may be required also. Correspondence educating processes require a much more diversified range of skills for substantive development and communication than is required normally for residential teaching-learning situations.

Fourth, it is required that the responsibilities of participants in the establishment of correspondence educating processes be clearly delineated, with such latitude that the 'full and free' employment of needed competencies is encouraged and not inhibited. Thus, this overall delineation of responsibilities is required not only to clarify areas of authority, but, equally important, it provides the framework within which the contributions of available competencies can be maximized.

Fifth, it is required that provisions be made for the evaluation of the goals and objectives of correspondence educating processes on a regular or periodic basis, so that developing educational needs and demands in the society can be met effectively and efficiently. This regularity of evaluative activity is required, however, not only to keep abreast of the changeable educational priorities, but it is crucial for policy-making processes which function dynamically to cope successfully with these changing priorities.

These five requirements—role or function, legitimization, needed competencies, delineation of responsibilities, and regularity of evaluation—together constitute one set of general criteria which can be used in conjunction with others in the formation of policy judgments on the establishment of correspondence educating processes. Other criteria useful for policy judgments on the integration of correspondence with mainstream educating processes are outlined briefly below.

The following statements on the integration of correspondence with mainstream educating processes are closely allied with the criteria on establishment given above, and some overlapping is apparent. These statements are gleaned from the responses to the inquiry and from relevant literature, and they only indicate some of the crucial elements involved for integration.

There is a need to specify the authorized relationship of correspondence educating processes with other educating processes in the system, preferably with emphasis on integration, or, where this is not feasible at first, with emphasis on collaboration, rather than on the divisive lines of differences.

There is need to state clearly any initial constraints or limitations on correspondence educating processes, with the usual latitude for dynamic exploration of new possibilities.

There is need to specify the target population to be served by correspondence educating processes, again with latitude for exploration of new service possibilities.

There is need to state clearly and substantially the commitment of resources for correspondence educating processes, in terms of priority order in relation to other purposes in the system. This includes the need to specify any special provisions for financial management and budgeting practices required for correspondence educating processes.

There is a need to state definitively any *special* conditions governing the employment, training, and compensation of personnel for correspondence educating processes, wherever these differ substantially from the routines for other educating processes in the system.

It is, of course, a matter of practical common sense that a society's or an institution's policies for correspondence educating processes are not based entirely upon a few abstract statements of criteria similar to those above. Each society, institution, or agency must formulate its own set of criteria, uniquely adapted to its needs, demands, and priorities. However, even with the statements of policies uniquely formulated, there remains a crucial task of translating the policy statements into operational terms. This is the function of the planning processes, to which attention is given next in Chapter 8.

Chapter 8

Planning Processes

Planning is fundamentally a continuing technical activity closely allied with the policy decision-making processes. Further, as one respondent put it metaphorically, policy and planning go hand in hand. At times, it is purely academic to argue which comes first, policy or planning. For purposes of consistency in sequence, the policy-first pattern is adhered to in most of this report. Also in this report an attempt is made to view the planning processes more from the authorizing than from the operating perspective. To a considerable extent, the literature on planning correspondence educating processes relates to course and curriculum development activities. However, in this report, an overall perspective of planning is required as a follow-through on the general policy-making processes discussed in Chapter 7. Like the policy-making processes, the planning processes are dynamic, not static; and there is continuing feedback between the policy and planning processes in the dynamics of the educating activities in the society.

With this as background, the focus of the inquiry on planning is limited to dynamic aspects of planning processes as denoted in this basic question put to prospective respondents : How do you go about planning your correspondence educating processes ? As is true of other basic questions in the inquiry, this basic question is followed by a series of more specific questions designed to elicit responses to particular aspects of the basic question. Admittedly, the question on planning processes presented a real challenge to prospective respondents, since, unlike policy-making, planning per se is not readily definable within the hierarchical educational complex of most societies.

The responses to the difficult question on planning processes reveal a wide range of approaches and purposes. The belief held in some circles that educational planning research represents little more than a series of probes with a range wide enough to challenge even the most expert taxonomist would appear to have yet another verification by the probe made in this inquiry. While the open-ended basic question did succeed in eliciting some responses on overall planning processes, most of the responses related to course development activities. Even so, there are among the comments several examples in which correspondence educating processes are viewed in the perspective of the overall role or function intended. It was from this perspective that inquiry was made on planning correspondence educating processes.

The responses to the series of 'yes' and 'no' questions which followed the basic open-ended question are indicative of the planning patterns of some of the respondents. Almost half (46%) the respondents indicated that they have a working guide or handbook for initiating and following-through on planning correspondence educating processes, fifty-two percent do not, and two percent did not answer the question.

Seventy-two percent state that their planning includes both quantitative and qualitative aspects of correspondence educating processes; twenty-two percent indicated that their planning does not, six percent did not answer.

In response to a key subquestion, eighty-two percent answered affirmatively that their planning 'model' is a continuous action process, running from the diagnosis and assessment of present needs through implementation of plans to meet the needs to evaluation and revision as required by experience, and eighteen percent indicated that theirs is not.

Forty-six percent indicated that their planning processes include participation of people with different kinds of backgrounds and orientation: teachers, parents, lay citizens, professional consultants and others, and fifty-four percent indicated that theirs do not.

In another vein, a subquestion inquired concerning current planning priorities for certain categories, including needs of society, needs of students, future flows of students, etc. The responses show that the changing needs of students rank first and the changing needs of society second in planning priorities. The other choices fell far behind these two top factors.

A final subquestion inquired concerning any anticipated changes in planning correspondence educating processes. The great majority indicated that no changes are anticipated. However, some indicated a need for greater expertise in research and evaluation; others indicated the need for a more 'formalized system' and greater independence in program development; and still others indicated the need for a more effective use of communications technologies. The greatest agreement of all was on the need for the continuous planning of correspondence educating processes.

There are, of course, in every system, persons with leadership responsibility for planning educating activities, otherwise no planning would ever get done. This leadership for planning education might include expatriates as well as indigenous educational leaders. Even so, the general rule appears to be that planning correspondence educating processes is more of an *ad hoc* activity than an activity manned by full-time professionals in planning. Certainly, for this inquiry, some of the most practical statements on the problems of planning correspondence educating processes are given by respondents whose full-time responsibilities cover an exceedingly wide range of educational activities in addition to planning. While a goodly number of these additional activities might be said to fall within the category of the personally coined word "administrivia", they are nevertheless necessary within the dynamics of on-going correspondence educating processes.

The educational planning processes in the less industrialized human societies may differ significantly from those of the industrialized societies, as noted earlier in this chapter. Some of the literature on planning educating processes in general is addressed to certain aspects of these differences among the nations. As Bereday, *et al.* [1960], put it, "It is one thing to plan for a breakthrough, for planning then is essentially an emergency operation. It is another thing to plan after a measure of success has been achieved. The tools developed for a society of want may not be suitable for a society of abundance. . . ." And "The greater the number of people included in schools, the more divergent the . . . abilities and inclinations" [pp. 14-15].

Another aspect of the differences between industrialized and less-industrialized countries is in the kinds of emphasis given in planning educating processes. For example, some societies, particularly the more economically advanced ones, are said to emphasize educational planning processes in which the size and structure of the educating system is determined to a large extent by the 'market place'. In these societies there is said to be a concentration on the 'efficiency' relationship between the system's 'input' (i.e., learners) and its 'output' (i.e., graduates). On the other hand, among the less-economically advanced societies more emphasis is placed on making the relationship between economic objectives of the society and the educational investment requirements explicit in their educational planning processes. This is sometimes referred to in the literature as the use man-power models in educational planning. [See again Chapter 5.]

The two examples of the differences that may exist between even these two very broad categories of human society, i.e., industrialized and non-industrialized, are suggestive of the complex task of trying to generalize about planning educating processes. With certain exceptions, planning practices do not follow with any discernible consistency those planning 'models' set forth in much of the literature. Bourgette [1972] suggests "The reason for this may be twofold. On the one hand the importance of planning as a major organizational activity may not yet be recognized in many organizations. On the other hand, it is likely that much of what is contained in literature is somewhat irrelevant as far as organizational needs are concerned; therefore, practitioners tend to ignore the models" [in Miklos, *et al.*, pp. 70-71].

However, this glimpse of the complexities in planning educating processes is not to imply that guidelines, however roughhewn, do not exist, because they do. For example, a rather long questionnaire sent by the International Bureau of Education received replies from

75 nations on educational planning. As one follow-up on that inquiry, Inbar [1973] made an analysis of the replies to try "to find basic relationships between some of the components" of educational planning, and end up "by shaping some basic organizational patterns for educational planning", as they emerge "from the IBE survey", He concluded from his analysis that three basic patterns of educational planning can be identified, based upon the information and data of the IBE inquiry.

Pattern A : Responsibility for educational planning is vested in a top-level central body *outside* the Ministry of Education. The educational plans are compulsorily implemented. The educational plans are a part of an overall plan for all state activities. There is a fixed or specified period or time-span for the educational plan handed down by the central body.

Pattern B : Responsibility for educational planning is vested in the Ministry of Education and compliance is compulsory. However, the types of educational planning vary : The educational plans may be part of an overall plan for all state activities; or they may be linked with but not part of an overall plan for the state; or they may be entirely independent of other types of statewide planning. There may be a fixed time-span or there may be no definite period, with planning considered a continuous process.

Pattern C : Responsibility for educational planning is not vested in a special or central body, but is done by a multiplicity of authorities, such as universities, foundations, etc. The educational plans are usually recommendations or suggestions. The educational plans are independent of other types of state plans. There may be one or more separate plans bearing on one or more aspects of education. Planning is considered a continuous process.

These three broadly outlined patterns identified by Inbar are suggestive of certain of the tendencies in planning educating processes from a worldwide perspective. Inbar identifies Pattern B as that which approximates planning educating processes in many of the developing nations.

An example of certain types of general observations on the *Elements of Educational Planning* is the UNESCO publication by this title in 1963 (see the bibliography).

It is obvious that not every detail of planning educating processes in general is applicable to the correspondence educating integral. Nevertheless, the main principles of preparing a set of decisions for educational actions to be taken in the future (in compliance with policy requirements) are applicable in varying degrees to all the educating strategies involved, including those of the correspondence educating integral whenever appropriate.

In essence, planning in education is the attempt to plot the future course of educating activities on the basis of currently available data and information, and on the projected futures in the society. However, the planning of educating activities is specially burdened with uncertainties about the future, particularly with reference to the future types of priority educational needs in the society. This basic concern is exacerbated by the fact that, increasingly, the set of decisions on future educating activities must be made in the midst of dynamically expanding systems which require flexibility to accommodate social demand and individual pressures for education.

Whether or not the educating processes are public or private, integrated with or separate from a larger system, centrally or locally administered, or whether or not the central planning of education is integrated with planning for the economy as a whole, the final answers in any generalizable sense have not been found. Each society must, yet again, tailor-make its own functionality in this aspect. Whatever the tailor-made pattern for planning processes, there must be a close tie-in with the organizing processes, to which attention is given next in Chapter 9.

60

Chapter 9

Organizing Processes

Organizing processes are linked directly with policy and planning processes discussed in the two preceding chapters. As policy and planning processes change to meet varying needs and priorities in the educating system, the organizing processes change also, since various teaching-learning strategies require different teaching-learning environments. Thus, organizing processes function dynamically in the creation of the teaching-learning environment of the educating system, whether that environment is for the contiguous or non-contiguous learner.

Basically, at any given time, an organization may be viewed as the relation structure within which individuals coordinate their efforts for the attainment of stated purposes or goals. In an educating system, the basic purpose of organization is to facilitate the learning efforts of individual learners in the system. The extent to which this is accomplished is a measure of the effectiveness of the system in realizing its goals.

An organization requires an organizational unit (or organizational units) around which to build the relation structure. There are at least two very broad categories of relation structures which may be used to illustrate the use of organizational units in an educating system. The first of these is represented by the classroom as an organizational unit, and the second is represented by an idealized individual learner as an organizational unit.

This distinction in organization units is a key element in the different organizing processes and resultant organizational configurations of many correspondence systems vis-a-vis conventional educating systems.

The basic purpose of the inquiry on the organizing processes element was to obtain as much information as feasible on the existing organizational configurations of correspondence educating systems, and to learn something of the rationale for the present organizing processes. To do this, a basic open-ended question and a key open-ended subquestion were asked. The basic question : What is the organization structure of your correspondence educating system ? And the key subquestion : How would you state the rationale for the present organization structure of your correspondence educating system ? Selected responses to these open-ended questions are given below :

"As an organization, the Directorate is a teaching department of the University so far as the working conditions of the members of the staff are concerned. The courses and examinations are the same as in the affiliated colleges and University Teaching Departments, except when we devise some courses taught exclusively by our Directorate.

"The basic rationale for the present structure is the ever-increasing social demand for higher education and the necessity to evolve an economical method of meeting this demand. The Correspondence Courses follow the same syllabi . . . prescribed for the colleges and University Teaching Departments so that the students of Correspondence Courses may not be considered inferior to the regular students.

"The overall organization will remain basically the same. Certain changes in the organizational structure of the teaching and the non-teaching staff may be possible when the Directorate is given more autonomy . . . . We may set up a Research and Evaluation cell in the Directorate as also an independent printing press unit. Some additional posts may also have to be created to cope with the growing quantum of work. Such posts may include, besides purely teaching posts, a Deputy Director, Technical Assistants, Design and Production Officer, etc". [Punjabi University, India]

"The overall organization of the institute has been built around the controlling services, that is to say, centered upon the students themselves". [Centre National de Tele-Enseignment (CNTE)., Vanves, France]

"Independent Study by Extension is the delivery system for correspondence courses written and taught by members of the academic departments of the University of North Carolina. The course credit is actually awarded by the University (through each department). Thus, Independent Study by Extension is integrated into the University as a whole. Presently courses are available from two of the University campuses (UNC-Chapel Hill and N. C. State). . . . It is anticipated that additional members of the sixteen-institution system will join in offering courses through Independent Study by Extension. An Advisory Committee with representatives from each of the institutions offering Independent Study courses through the central administrative office at Chapel Hill gives guidance on policy, course selection, and the future development of Independent Study by Extension . . . .

"The basic rationale for the present organization structure is as follows : Independent Study (correspondence) is an alternative method of instruction available to those who choose to use it for whatever reason. The correspondence method is a delivery system, just as the classroom lecture is a delivery system. The course content should be of the same level as the equivalent course taught on campus and is the responsibility of the faculty member writing the study guide and his department chairman or departmental review committee. Expertise in distance instruction is furnished by the Independent Study by Extension staff. Credit is awarded by the University itself. An Independent Study course is a University course : Independent Study by Extension does not maintain a separate faculty.

"The Independent Study by Extension office serves as the administrative center for correspondence courses written and taught through any institution of the University. Such a centralized structure avoids both duplication of administrative costs and duplication of course offerings whenever possible. It allows some institutions to participate in Independent Study instruction when they would not be able to if they had to assume the total costs of operation. With cooperative effort of many schools, more variety and depth can be made available in course offerings to the state's citizens. . . ." [The University of North Carolina, U. S. A.]

These comments, selected from among those received, are indicative of the types of organizational thinking and practice in the institutions and agencies of respondents. Over eighty percent of the respondents indicate that their organizational structures are integrated with a larger system, and over fifty percent have charts showing their organizational structures. For most of the respondents with integrated systems, the patterns of organizational charts follow those of the larger system. This is particularly true of respondents from university complexes.

In some of these complexes, the integrative, yet somewhat subsidiary, role of the correspondence system is clearly indicated by the statements of respondents. For example, such comments as "(the) organizational role is (that of a) *delivery system* for the academic resources at the University, including continuing education", and "correspondence education *belongs* . . . to University Extension", and "We are *an agency* through which the courses of our university are offered", all reflect, subsidiarily, elements of integration between conventional and correspondence systems.

As pointed up in the theoretical discussions at the beginning of this chapter, charts of organizing educating processes, with the learners' needs clearly delineated, are not available as a general rule. Instead, what usually exists is a diagrammatic portrayal of the hierarchical administrative arrangements for operation. It comes as no surprise, therefore, to find that the organizational charts for correspondence educating systems follow the usual patterns. However, this is not to imply any lack of concern for the educational needs of learners, since, ostensibly, the basic purpose of administrative arrangements is to facilitate servicing the learners in the system. In Chapter 8 on planning processes it was noted that the needs of learners rank highest among priority planning items; and, for this chapter the charts prepared in the greatest detail reflect an implicit concern for the unique requirements of learners in non-contiguous teaching-learning situations.

As in every other aspect of educating processes, the organizational pattern of an educational system reflects in a large measure the major political and social values of the society in which the system has its being, since the ultimate decisions on educational matters are political. This is true whether contiguous or non-contiguous educating strategies are employed. Therefore, in this fundamental sense, correspondence educating processes cannot be isolated from the other educating processes in the system, or from the society in which it exists. A good example of the pervasive influence of political values is in the types of emphasis given in education in various societies. In some societies the all-important worth of the individual is emphasized, while in other societies the good of the society as a whole is held to be pre-eminent. Although neither group of societies holds to one point of view to the complete exclusion of the other, the difference in the types of emphasis given in each group is real and distinct.

The educating processes, organizationally and otherwise, can but be affected by these different sets of attitudes and resultant patterns of behavior.

Further, in many nations there are different authorities organizing correspondence educating processes at different levels, usually for different groups of learners in the system. However, in some societies there is complete overall, that is to say, total, control of educating processes, contiguous and/or non-contiguous. And, of course, there are societies with control of educating processes in between these two broadly categorized extremes. [See again Patterns A, B, and C outlined earlier in Chapter 8.]

The high percentage of correspondence educating processes which follow the vertical structure of the conventional system is an indication of how deeply the organizing and operating patterns of the correspondence systems are affected by the larger system, whether or not there is formal integration. Seventy-six percent of the respondents indicated that the vertical structure of their correspondence educating system does not deviate significantly from the usual elementary, secondary, technical, or tertiary vertical structure of the conventional system. Sixteen percent indicated that vertical structures do differ from the conventional. This sixteen percent was made up largely of privately sponsored systems with vocational-technical offerings. This does not imply that all proprietary systems are in this category, since some private systems offer academic-type courses in strict conformance with the conventional system. Eight percent of the respondents did not reply to the question.

There is no best way that meets the purposes of the vast array of organizing processes and resultant organizational configurations worldwide. Further, this report provides no basis for generalizations, even if such were possible. Instead of any unwarranted generalizations, there is presented below a highly selected list of suggested readings on some of the basic concerns of organizing correspondence educating processes, and of ways of coping with these concerns. These readings are among the best that can be found on organizing correspondence educating processes at present. All the suggested readings are in publications listed in the bibliography to this report.

For some of the most recent discussions on approaches and trends in organizing correspondence educating processes, see the contributions of Erdos on "The System of Distance Education" (pages 9—19); of McD. Mitchell on "Carte Blanche to Organize the Ideal Distance Education Institute" (pages 25—30); of Bakhshish Singh on "The Role and Organization of an Ideal Distance Education Institute" (pages 31—38); and of Conrad Wiedhaup on "Carte Blanche for Distance Education" (pages 39—41). All the above contributions are in the papers to the Tenth ICCE Conference, Brighton, England, 1975.

For perspectives on two university systems well organized and operating in two different environmental settings, see the contributions of Kevin Smith on "External Studies at the University of New England" (pages 161—169), and of Paul Chang Min Phang on "Planning and Administering a University Off-Campus Academic Programme in a Plural Society" (pages 146—154). Both these contributions are also in the Tenth ICCE Conference papers, Brighton, England, 1975.

For other examples of organizing correspondence educating processes, see Martin M. Kaunda's contribution in *Mass Education*, Edstrom, *et al.*, eds., pages 337—353. Also, see the booklet entitled *Correspondence Teaching at University*, by Judy El-Bushra for a review of several kinds of organizational patterns at the tertiary level.

These few selected readings suggest the vast variety of approaches and trends in organizing correspondence educating processes. The readings are not cited with any expectation that there will be direct transferability of organizing patterns from one society to another. As with other aspects, each society will tailor-make its own organizing functionality. Even so, it is entirely possible for one human society to gain ideas from another, and to build on those ideas to meet its own unique needs.

Whatever the resultant configurations of organizing educating processes, there are other links in the policy-making/planning/organizing chain which must be taken into account. One of these links is the 'operating processes', which is the subject of Chapter 10 following.

Chapter 10

Operating Processes

Organizing processes discussed in Chapter 9 provide what may be thought of as a super-structured framework within which operating processes are carried on. Similarly, the administration functions are subject to the organizational configurations resulting from the organizing processes. Thus, within the dynamics of on-going activities, it is frequently difficult to state clearly where administration begins and ends vis-a-vis operation. For this reason, the title of this chapter could have been 'administrating processes' as readily as 'operating processes'. In each case, the dynamic, rather than the static, state of affairs is emphasized.

However, for purposes of this report, a distinction is made between the two types of activities. In this distinction, administrating processes function to provide the working environment in which the operating processes are carried on effectively and efficiently. Thus, while the administrating processes may be the least visible of the two interrelated sets of processes, their influence is pervasive nevertheless. For example, there is continuing need for administrative services in the development of technical staffs and academic faculties, in budgeting, in short-term and long-term planning projects, in the supervision of sections handling general correspondence, in maintaining relations with the public and with other institutions and systems, and so on.

On the other hand, operating correspondence educating processes is concerned principally with the development, production, and distribution of materials for learning. This is what the vast majority of professionals in correspondence educating processes do on a day-to-day basis. The operating activities may include, among others, some planning, budgeting, staffing, directing, evaluating, and reporting. However, these functions are performed primarily in direct relation to course or program development, production, and distribution work. Thus, in a large majority of societies, the expression 'operating correspondence educating processes' denotes the performance of such duties as course preparation and course instruction, course examinations, student counseling and services, accreditation activities, office management, and may be some research on and evaluation of the program as a whole. To perform these and other associated duties, the professional in correspondence educating processes may develop and publish criteria and standards as basic guides for operating processes.

One of the initial intents of this inquiry was to bring to the fore the unmet need for guidelines to authorize, as contrasted with guidelines to operate, correspondence educating processes. It was realized that, at best, this unmet need could be fulfilled only partially : there simply is not enough experience, recorded or otherwise readily available, to provide normative information and data upon which to base meaningful generalizations on authorizing correspondence educating processes. Professionals are engaged busily and seriously with the operating aspects of correspondence educating processes, and only to a very limited extent, if at all, are they concerned with aspects of the overall authorizing level. Even so, some of the responses to the basic question and to the sub-questions on operating correspondence educating processes provide insights on the principles and practices involved.

The basic question on operating processes is open-ended : "What are the operational processes of your correspondence educating system ?" The series of sub-questions following the basic question elicit definitive replies to specific operating elements and trends. The responses to the sub-questions are linked most closely to certain of the principles involved, and are considered first below.

In order that the role or function is understood clearly, it is generally required that a set of guidelines exist for operating correspondence educating processes. In response to a sub-question on the availability of guidelines for operation, sixty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that they do have such working guidelines, and only thirty percent state that they do not. Two percent of the respondents did not answer the question.

While most respondents to this inquiry have working guidelines for operation, this principle is by no means put into practice universally. Further, the guidelines, as would be expected, vary over a wide range of types. In the main, the guidelines are structured for highly parochial situations and therefore are not suitable for general use outside those situations. Each system tailor-makes its own guidelines, structured somewhat, but not entirely, along lines discussed in Chapter 4, particularly in the section on doctrine. No pattern for universal use was found in this inquiry.

As noted before, the large majority of respondents to this inquiry are in publicly supported systems integrated with or closely related to larger educating systems in the society. Thus, fully seventy percent of the responses to the question on operation indicated being integrated with or related to a larger system. Twenty-two percent are not integrated, and eight percent did not answer the question. The twenty-two percent are mostly privately (commercially) sponsored systems which are not integrated. However, it does not include the private (church-affiliated, etc.) colleges, which are integrated for the most part.

It is not to be concluded from the above that in every case of integration the correspondence program of offerings is but an 'extension' of residential or campus programs to a larger and more diversified target group, for this is not so. The respondents recognize fully that patterns for the horizontal spread of programs to off-campus learners with widely varying backgrounds differ significantly from those for full-time, on-campus late-in-the-teenage learners with relatively homogeneous backgrounds. Thus, both the vertical and the horizontal aspects of mobility and choice within the educating system are equally important. However, as noted earlier, the vertical structure of correspondence educating processes is patterned after that of the conventional system. While, on the other hand, the horizontal spread of learning opportunities to non-contiguous learners requires patterns different from the conventional patterns.

While the principles involved here are known widely among professional educators, the principles have not always been applied in practical situations. Two of the basic principles involved are put into succinct terms by Faure, *et al.* [1972]. One principle is that "Education should be dispensed and acquired through a multiplicity of means. The important thing is not the path an individual has followed, but what he has learned or acquired" [p. 185]. This is, quite obviously, a basic principle in effective and efficient educating processes generally. Another principle is that "An over-all open education system helps learners to move within it, both horizontally and vertically, and widens the range of choices available to them" [p. 188]. This principle is related specifically to the topic under discussion at present.

One impetus to the application of the principles involved is in the growth in programs for recurrent and concurrent education. As mentioned before, the 'fixed time and place for education' modality is being eroded increasingly by new patterns of thinking about educating processes. For example, as the concepts of recurrent and of concurrent learning becomes more widely understood and practiced, the spread of horizontal learning opportunities increases. The concurrent and recurrent educating programs cover an exceedingly wide range, from updating the half-or quarter-life knowledge of a variety of vocational and/or professional pursuits for the individuals concerned to a "mass" conscientization on health education, such as that conducted by Hall. [See ICCE *Proceedings*, Tenth Conference, 1975, pp. 101—105.]

This horizontal spread of opportunities to learn involves not only the frequently limited human and financial resources of correspondence educating "units", as they are called in some societies, but this horizontal spread involves as well the more elaborately structured other "divisions" and "faculties" in large university complexes. Thus it is again that an integrative process goes on as more and more inroads are made by the larger "Extension" divisions, and even by residential "faculties", on the learning opportunities provided for other than "regular" full-time, on-campus learners. The integration of faculties (teachers) for all classes of learners is, of course, by contract in some systems, by design in others, and by happen-stance in still others, to give only three out of a wide variety of types of arrangement. But whether purposeful or otherwise, the modality of the integration principle is spreading, slowly.

It is an important principle that the teachers in correspondence educating processes not only meet the usual academic qualifications required of all teachers, but that they qualify as well for teaching learners at a physical distance from the normal classroom setting. In response to a sub-question on this aspect, sixty-two percent of the respondents indicated that they do not have criteria specially designed for the recruitment and/or training of teachers and technical staffs of correspondence educating processes; thirty-two percent indicated that they do have such criteria; and six percent did not answer the question.

The intent of this sub-question was to learn what criteria, if any, are employed for recruitment and/or training of professional teachers, technical staffs, management (administrative) personnel, course writers, and editors, copy readers, and others. These are the crucial personnel for 'operationalizing' ***a system*** of correspondence educating concepts. They constitute the leadership cohort; hence their importance. The results appear to be some-what disconcerting; but there are certain types of qualification that can be mentioned.

It is realized that the majority of respondents are integrated with or closely allied to a larger system, usually in a university complex. Thus, there is heavy reliance upon the university's residential faculty standards, in many cases, for recruitment criteria. This probably accounts for only thirty-two percent of the respondents with criteria uniquely designed for the non-contiguous teacher. Further, in some cases, as noted earlier, the courses "belong" to a regular residential faculty, and the correspondence unit serves in an administrative capacity only. In such cases, the correspondence unit has no need to recruit, since this is done under auspices of the residential faculties. Finally, in many situations there is still heavy dependence upon tutorial and/or some type of ad hoc arrangement in which the readers and graders of papers or lessons from learners are employed as needed, and, in a few cases, even as available. In such cases, elaborate criteria uniquely designed for the employment of professional teachers for a correspondence educating system are seldom if ever drawn up. Usually, only minimal acceptable academic standards are set and adhered to.

Nevertheless, whatever the legitimate extenuating circumstance in a given case, the basic principle does not change, i.e., contiguous and non-contiguous teaching-learning environments require different approaches and techniques. For example, the university professor or a secondary school teacher accustomed to the contiguous group of learners will require reorientation of instructional attitudes and behaviors for the non-contiguous individual learner. A 'good' classroom teacher may not be as effective in a non-contiguous teaching-learning situation, any more than textbook material prepared for the classroom would be suitable, necessarily, for the learner at a physical distance from the classroom.

In response to a sub-question regarding decision-making on what services are to be provided, and why, fifty-two percent of the respondents indicated that they follow a clearly outlined sequence of steps to arrive at decisions on services to be provided in their systems. In general, the steps followed by respondents include, not necessarily in this order, a consideration of learner and/or societal needs and requirements; consultations with knowledgeable persons both inside and outside the system; avoidance of unnecessary duplication of available services; requirements for audio-video aids; tutorial and other instructional requirements; approvals by faculties, where appropriate; and cost. All of these steps are subsumptive, of course, to the general regulations and policy guidelines provided by the appropriate educational leadership and authorities in the society. This series of steps is neither exhaustive nor indicative, but it is suggestive of the kinds of considerations administrators employ at the operating level of some systems in determining *what* services to provide, and *why*.

An example of services uniquely tailor-made for the educating purposes intended in a rural setting is that given in the response from INADES, Dapango (Togo), Africa : "Our procedure is to give visits, at a frequency of about every five lessons, to the students following our courses. We speak of a series of courses, putting less emphasis on time. What our students learn they put directly into application; there is no waiting to attain a certain level of course instruction. . . . We go into the field to see if the farmer has put into application that which he has studied. There is no diploma. The fruits of the farmer's studies will be found in a well-stocked barn".

The situation is somewhat different when the correspondence educating processes are integrated with a larger, complex, university system. One example of this is that given in the response from the University of North Carolina in the U. S. A.: "In operation, independent study by Extension is integrated within a larger system. . . . Decision-making about services and courses to provide through independent (correspondence) study is influenced by the Statewide Advisory Committee, with representatives from each of the campuses that are participating in independent study. Locally, decisions are determined through on going planning sessions held by Assistant Directors of Extension and the Acting Director. Input from student course evaluations and from instructors influence the Independent Study offerings".

The patterns of decision-making on what services to provide is also different when the policy-making bodies include a Ministry of Education, along with others. An example of this is that given in the response from Punjabi University in India : "(The operation of Punjabi University) is related to the larger system of education insofar as the Directorate (of Correspondence Courses) has to follow the same syllabi and operate within the same system of examinations as obtains for regular college and university students. The modus operandi is, however, necessarily different as the teaching has to be organised for distance learners and not for classroom situations. . . . The basic services . . . are provided in accordance with the U. G. C. (University Grants Commission) policies and the guidelines given by the Standing Committee of the University Senate. Additional services . . . are decided by the Director in Consultation with members of the staff and necessary approval is obtained from the Vice-Chancellor and the Senate of the University".

Finally, an even different pattern is evident when the Ministry of Education is the sole policy-making authority. One example of this arrangement is that given in the response from the Centre National de Tele-Enseignement (CNTE) in France : "(The CNTE system) is related to the general educational system elaborated by the Ministry of Education. . . . Before we decide to launch a course or a series of courses, we consider the needs and nature of the prospective students and the objectives to be reached; we consult with experts and recruit instructors. For many of the courses provided, audio-oral aids (tapes, cassettes, records, and radio programmes) and periodical group sessions with tutorial guidance are organized".

These selected examples are not exhaustive, obviously, of the interpretations and meaning of 'services' provided in correspondence educating processes. However, the examples are selected from societies varying widely in their approaches to the common problem of the *what* and the *why* of services to be provided. The variations represented are from a rural or farm setting with 'practical' services required, through two types of approaches at the tertiary academic level, to a centralized approach at the secondary level.

In a related sub-question on which of the *forms* of correspondence educating processes to use, sixty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that there are identifiable factors that influence or determine the forms used. These factors include, principally, geographical, demographical, economic, educational, and other considerations along the lines of those discussed in Chapter 6 of this report. The usual forms in use include individual, group, supervised study, and a variety of different combinations of these forms. A highly diversified correspondence educating system may include not only the usual individual, group, and supervised study arrangements, but may include also provisions for learning by radio, radio-vision, television, computers, mixed-media, 'contract' study, packaged courses, credit by examinations, and others.

The examples of factors that influence which of the forms to use vary widely in accordance with the learning environments required. One example of an educational factor which influences the choice of the form used is that given in the response from the Correspondence Course Unit, Luanshya, Zambia : "The supervised study groups were introduced to cater for the increased primary school leavers who could not find places in conventional secondary schools. Over 60% of primary school leavers drop out of the formal system because of limited schools." The influencing factor here is clearly the need to provide educational opportunities for large numbers of school-age learners in the society.

Another, but somewhat different, example of an educational factor which influences the choice of the forms used is that given in the response from Adelaide College of Advanced Education, Australia : "Some subjects require group interactions; (some) require access to major library resources; (some) require access to media playback facilities; (some) require compulsory attendance at occasional seminars, (and some) require that students be accessible readily to the lectures if needed". Clearly, the influencing educational factor here is that of the subject matter involved in addition to others.

An example of a geographical factor which influences the forms used is that given in the response from New England University, Armidale, Australia : "The New England system is very much a centralized teaching process in which students are either brought to the University to attend compulsory residential schools . . . or academic staff visit various centers conducting lectures and tutorials at weekend schools which are voluntary. . . . We offer over 250 discrete to about 4,000 students spread over a large geographical area, mainly in New South Wales. Essentially the teaching-learning process depends heavily upon independent study supplemented by student-student and student-staff interaction as weekend and residential schools". The influence of the geographical factor, among others, is evident here.

The influencing factors on the forms used may be different yet when the vocational or professional category of the learner is the focal point. An example of this is that given in the response from the Correspondence Institute, Co-operative Education Centre, Moshi, Tanzania, Africa : "Cooperatives have three key categories of persons involved in running them. They have different degrees of understanding, (and) their background is different. Hence, employed workers study on an individual basis; committee (members) on a group study basis; and (regular) members on a group and supervised study basis". Obviously, the rank within the hierarchical structure, among others, is an influencing factor on the form used here.

Whatever the courses and other services provided, and whatever the forms used, it is a basic principle that the correspondence educating materials must be clear, accurate, and understandable to the learner. This principle is crucial for the success of all other elements of the educating processes. It is as applicable to correspondence educating processes in a rural African setting, in which the successful learner may be one with a 'well stocked barn,' as to the most elaborate and complex system known. For, repetitious though it is, the educating materials are for the learners, and this requires that the orientation, structure, and language therein be geared for learners. It is essential, therefore, that the needs and requirements of learners be kept clearly in focus. not only by on-the-job professionals, but by overall decision-makers as well.

It is not surprising to find in this inquiry that no other area of operating correspondence educating systems receives as much attention as course development and preparation work.

In response to a sub-question on this aspect, sixty-six percent of the respondents indicated that they have procedures for following through to assess the clearness, accuracy, and understandability of the correspondence educating materials *for the learners* in their systems, twenty-eight percent indicated that they do not, and six percent did not answer the questions.

There are many cases in which there is heavy reliance upon the completion of 'course evaluation forms' supplied to students. Usually, these forms are filled in after the learner either completes or drops out. Thus, the forms of this type provide an overall evaluation of the materials by the learner, but they do not, as a rule, pinpoint the lack of clearness or understandability of a particular lesson or of an item or question within a lesson.

In an overview perspective, it is evident that operating correspondence educating processes includes a variegated pattern of activities : curriculum planning, either general or limited; supervising program and course preparation; supervising teaching-learning processes; and general administration and office management routines. In the close-up, these variegated functions are seen to involve a myriad of detailed decision-making at the on-the-job level of an administrator. It is a cardinal principle for effective and efficient operation that planned flexibility for local decision-making be a part of the policy-making decisions at the overall level. This flexibility is required for even the totally controlled centralized system.

The policy-making/planning/organizing/operating chain of processes, discussed so far, are all for naught unless there is tangible evidence that the quality level of the system becomes and remains at or above certain minimum levels, as pre-determined by an agency outside the system. This is the central concern of evaluating and accrediting processes discussed in Chapter 11, which follows.

Chapter 11

Evaluating and Accrediting Processes

The building of a quality system of educating processes is not an easy endeavor, as noted in Chapter 4 on education institution building. Quality is an attribute, a difference in kind, rather than a difference in amount. In view of this, the popular acceptability of an educational enterprise on the basis of quality involves not only the formalized "accreditation" of an institution by an authorized accrediting agency, but it involves as well both objective and subjective evaluative judgments made in the society at large.

Whereas the objective judgments are based normally upon measurable differences in amount, such as faculty credentials, library and laboratory facilities, teaching hours per instructor, etc., the subjective judgments are much more difficult to define or categorize as to ongoing processes or even as to intent. Subjective judgments may be favorable or prejudicial, dependent upon the individual, the institution, the society, or upon other factors. For example, there is yet much prejudicial thinking to be overcome in many societies in order to achieve equal recognition of correspondence vis-a-vis conventional educating processes.

Ultimately, accreditation of an educational enterprise is the end result of evaluative judgments made on the basis of data and information about the institution and system concerned, in terms of the criteria and standards established for the purpose. Within recent times, there appears to be increasing emphasis on the self-evaluation approach in evaluating and accrediting processes.

In a panel discussion at the Seventh ICCE Conference in Stockholm, Dean Summers made an insightful statement on the concept of accreditation, with a closing observation on the accreditation vis-a-vis acceptability of an educational enterprise. Because of the relevance of that statement to the focus of this chapter, it is quoted in substantial portion below :

"You have noted that the term 'accreditation', as applied to educational institutions, has different meanings in different parts of the world and apparently different meanings according to the level and kind of education to which it applies. In some places it is specifically the function of government or of a ministry or office of education. In others, it is an institutional responsibility . . . . Perhaps the most general observation that can be made is that accreditation is usually by an indigenous institution or authority.

"The concept of school or institutional accreditation has changed . . . from a concept of rigid, minimum quantitative measures . . . to an appraisal of the total effectiveness of the institution in some over-all program of education. Although there is still reliance on the objective measures or on appraisal by visitors from outside, the emphasis is shifting to selfevaluation and the benefits likely to result from preparation for the accreditation visit and from continuous emphasis on high standards and the qualities that are considered important.

"Basic to this type of accreditation is the necessity that the institution, school, or educational enterprise, should state clearly, specifically, and concisely the objectives and aims of its program, the quality expected among its students, the functions it desires to perform, and the nature of the administrative and service organization available to facilitate its educational aims. It is important that the state aims and purposes should be well understood by and agreeable to the faculty. Prospective students, likewise, should have ready access to understanding of the purposes, facilities, records, costs, refund policies, efficiency, and statutory bases of the activity.

"But *acceptability* of educational enterprises is much deeper than *accreditation*. Perhaps this is true especially where accreditation is essentially voluntary in the interest of acquiring the status afforded by it. If there is to be truly recognized excellence, that must be independent of location......'it should be recognized both *within* and *outside* of the institution......" (p. 119)

The basic, open-ended question for this part of the report was designed to inquire into the policies, practices, and concerns of prospective respondents with regard to certification, accreditation, and credit-granting activities. The basic question asked was this : What are the certification, accreditation, and credit-granting policies and practices of and with respect to your correspondence educating system ? This basic question was followed by other sub-questions designed to elicit certain specific information and data. Some of the responses are summarized below.

Eighty-four percent of the respondents indicated that their academic and/or technical subjects are designed to be comparable to the same subjects in the regular or conventional education system ; twelve percent indicated that they are not ; and four percent did not reply to this question.

Based upon these percentages, the evidence seems clear that the courses offered by respondents qualify in substance or content for accreditation procedures used for conventional subjects. However, since the modes of communication in correspondence vis-a-vis conventional systems differ, the criteria for accreditation are modified in some societies to take this fact into account.

Seventy-two percent of the respondents indicated that their correspondence educating systems meet or exceed certain criteria, standards, and procedural requirements as pre-determined by an authorized government or other agency ; twenty-two percent indicated that they do not ; and six percent did not respond to the question. While these percentages indicate that a sizable majority of the systems of respondents meet or exceed accreditation requirements, the actual percentage of qualifying systems may be even larger. Some of the institutions which responded negatively to the question are sheltered under the general accreditation of the larger system to which they are integral. In such cases, there are no separate accreditation procedures for correspondence educating processes per se.

Fifty-six percent of respondents indicated that the accreditation of their system is integrated in a larger educational system, twenty-four percent indicated that their system is not, and twenty percent did not respond to the question. The reason for the relatively large lack of response to this question is not made clear by the respondents' comments. It may be conjectured, however, that this failure to respond 'yes' or 'no' to the question reflects again the difficulties certain systems have with the meaning of the concept of 'accreditation,' as already discussed above.

In order to gain further insight into the relation of the responses to this question on integrated accreditation and the responses to an earlier question on integrated policy-making machinery, cross-tabulation was made of the responses to these two questions, and the chi-square technique was employed to test the independence of integrated policy-making machinery and integrated accreditation. Chi-square is significant, and the two are not independent ; this means that when the policy-making machinery is integrated within a larger educational system or unit, the 'accreditation' is likely to be integrated as well, and vice versa.

The finding does not mean, necessarily, that 'acceptability,' as discussed earlier, is the same for the correspondence and conventional educating integrals, either within or outside the system. That is to say, the involvement of accreditation provisions within the policy-making machinery of the system does not mean that there is par acceptance in the policy-making body of conventional and correspondence methods for all respondents. The degrees of acceptance vary in different systems. For example, in some systems involvement is such that 'accreditation' is interpreted to mean "the same as" or "synonymous with" general standards of acceptability applicable for both full-time, on-campus learners and learners at a distance. In other systems, the degrees of acceptance within integrated systems vary so widely as to almost defy generalization, except to say that the acceptability status of the correspondence integral in the larger educational unit depends upon the professional, divisional, departmental, institutional or other policies involved.

Seventy percent of the respondents indicate that the teachers in their correspondence education systems are required to meet teacher certification standards applicable to conventional teaching staffs, fourteen percent indicated that they are not, and ten percent indicated that conventional standards are not applicable, primarily because of the nature of the occupational or vocational offerings involved. Also, the latter institutions do not define or seek 'accreditation' on the same basis as the conventional institution. The high percentage of institutions which require conventional standards for teachers is again indicative of the continuing close parallelism between correspondence and conventional course offerings and programs. This is particularly true among publicly supported programs as contrasted with the privately sponsored programs which tend to emphasize occupational and vocational offerings.

As stated earlier in the report, there is the continuing concern that teachers of learners in a contiguous group setting may not be the best qualified to instruct non-contiguous learners in an individualized situation. The vast majority of respondents reporting on teacher qualifications, however, did not indicate any provisions for the development of teachers for the non-contiguous learners. The prevailing assumption seems to be that qualifications required for conventional teachers are applicable also for teachers in correspondence educating processes. Further, it appears that evaluating and accrediting processes are not affected adversely by any lack of special training for teachers of learners at a distance.

Forty-two percent of the respondents indicated that students in their systems are required to meet admission standards applicable to conventional (full-time) students, thirty-six percent indicated that they are not, and sixteen percent indicated that 'admission standards', per se, are not required. Thus, the majority of learners in the correspondence educating systems of the respondents do not meet admission standards applicable to the conventional full-time students.

The learners in the correspondence systems represent a greater range of educational purposes than the students entering the conventional systems through the comparatively restrictive admissions requirements. This latter cohort of students is more likely to be in pursuit of 'formal' academic recognition. However, this is not to say that the non-contiguous students are without interest in such pursuits, for this is not the case.

"Openness" in admissions does not mean that the program of study to completion is any easier for the non-contiguous than for the contiguous learner. The common practice is that the two categories of learners must "pass" or satisfy the same final examination to receive comparable or the same academic recognition. There appears to be a lingering concern among many respondents that the non-contiguous learner may not be considered quite as "respectable", academically speaking, as the contiguous learner, unless strict precautions are taken to subject both classes of learners to the *same* examinations, wherever comparable academic recognition is the end in view. Thus, it is that "open admission", such as gives many correspondence educating systems one of their distinctive characteristics, provides opportunities to learn which may not be available otherwise; however, "openness" carries no guarantee or even assurance that the learner will progress through the system invariably to successful completion. One important reason for this is that many institutions or systems define "completion" in highly restrictive ways.

It is clear that there are at last two broad types of 'success' a learner may experience in the teaching-learning processes : one of these is academic success, as discussed above; the other is success of a purely personal nature, such as that attained for vocational, professional, recreational, cultural, or other personally satisfying purposes. In such personally satisfying educational pursuits, the learner has no academic awards, per se, in view; therefore, the drop-out label used to designate failure to achieve academic success is inappropriate when the personal objective of the learner is attained.

The literature is replete with comments similar to the one above, there is nothing new here. However, it is to be borne in mind that the comments generally emphasize the need to identify the educational purposes of the learner so that the dropout label can be applied appropriately; the comments do not imply that correspondence educating processes are devoid, inherently, of elements and requirements which may affect dropout rates adversely. In point of fact, the contrary to this view is likely to be closer to reality.

For example, among certain other basic requirements, such as ability to read and write in the language of instruction, correspondence educating processes require high self-motivation, self-discipline, and ability to ‘go it alone’ for some, much, or even most of the time. The learner accustomed to the face-to-face teaching-learning modality may need to learn-how-to-learn by correspondence, just as the face-to-face teacher may need to learn how to teach the learner at a distance.

Eighty-two percent of the respondents indicated that correspondence and conventional students received the same academic recognition for comparable work completed, six percent indicated that they do not, and twelve percent did not respond to the question. The percentage responding in the affirmative to this question is significant in size. It indicates that although there is a policy of ‘openness for entering the corrspondence educating system, the reqirements for ‘completion’ are the same for all students, irrespective of the teaching-learing paths followed.

The small percentage responding negatively to the question is an indication that the acceptance of parity between conventional and correspondence educating processes is progressing among the respondents at an encouraging rate The twelve percent not responding either way belong principally to that group with courses “not comparable” to conventional offerings.

Comments of respondents are indicative of the variegated patterns in evaluating and accrediting correspondence educating systems in the societies represented. From these and other comments, it is evident that no single pattern would meet the widely varying practices either among the societies generally or within a given society in some cases. The patterns vary equally as the educational organizational patterns discussed earlier in Chapter 9.

Evaluating and accrediting mechanisms of whatever stripe or variety are for the improvement of the quality of learning for the learner in the institution or system, or they are for naught, as noted earlier. The ultimate purpose in educating processes is that the student will learn well, or even at a superior level, that which the institution or system is trying to teach. Thus it is that accreditation is not an end in itself, but is a formalized means of taking action for improvement, in order to facilitate learning by the learner in the system. From this it is clear that accreditation for the sake of accreditation is little more than an exercise in the manipulation and arrangement of the things and processes of learning in accordance with a set of requirements and guidelines drawn up somewhat arbitrarily, and certainly inconclusively.

It is, of course, quite obvious that procedures for the overall accreditation of an institution or system do not include the detail provisions for evaluating student learning in a given course of study. Nevertheless, general standards, for example, on student recruitment or selection, student services, learning resources, assessment of learning, etc., are among the many other standards included normally in the requirements for accreditation.

The inclination in a slowly growing number of systems to involve self-evaluating process in accreditation procedures appears to give impetus to arrangements for the continuing or the periodic overall evaluation of some systems on their own, whether or not the question of accreditation is involved. In response to a subquestion on this matter, forty-two percent of the respondents indicated that they have such arrangements, thirty-eight percent indicated that they do not, and twenty percent did not respond to the question.

In a closely related subquestion, inquiry was made concerning the availability of a written statement on the *overall objectives* of the self-initiated evaluation of the correspondence educating processes. Only fourteen percent of the respondents indicated that they have such a written statement, but an overwhelming seventy-two percent indicated that they do not, and fourteen percent did not respond to the question.

When the results on these two subquestions are compared, it is clear that self-evaluations are being made without the availability of a written statement on the overall objectives in view. Thus it is that while some systems are carrying on self-evaluation on their own, without any specific reference to accreditation, in many cases the statement on objectives in written form is not yet available.

While criteria and standards for accreditation must be clear and complete, it is important that care is exercised to keep the tenor of the language as general as possible, in order not to inhibit or constrain the dynamic purposes evaluating and accrediting processes are designed to foster. Accrediting procedures heavy-laden with specificities tend to give the impression of trying to be exhaustive of the possibilities for the improvement of effectiveness and quality in educating processes. In this case, some institutions seeking accreditation may hesitate to do any more than what is specified. However, accrediting processes are dynamic, not static, in nature; therefore, in the ideal case, each institution or system acts continuingly to attain levels of quality clearly above the minimum ones required for initial accreditation.

Chapter 12

Research and Development Processes

There are a number of characterizations and classifications of the concept of research. There is no one conceptualization which fits all situations.

For purposes of this report, educational research is viewed as either basic (pure) or applied (practical). Basic research seeks broad generalizations to explain a wide range of educational phenomena. By contrast, applied research is aimed at solving specific educational problems and improving present practices in the educating system.

The purpose of the open-ended question sent to prospective respondents was to obtain information on the kinds of research activities being carried on, periodically, or sporadically. The basic question was this : What are the principal research and evaluation activities in your correspondence educating system ? A series of subquestions followed this basic question.

Only a minority of respondents have working guidelines for research activities in their system. In response to the specific question on this matter, thirty percent of the respondents indicated that they have such guidelines, fifty-eight percent indicated that they do not, and twelve percent did not respond to the question. In compliance with the request made in the question, some of the respondents included comments regarding research guidelines in their responses.

While many respondents do not conduct research on any scientific basis, they do conduct investigations or surveys to discover problem areas, trends, norms among students, etc., either on an *ad hoc* or on a more or less continuing basis. This is perhaps the most widley found pattern among respondents.

A majority of respondents, by a small margin, indicated that their research activities result in information and data which aid in the improvement of teaching-learning materials for correspondence educating processes. Fifty-four percent of the respondents answered affirmatively on this subquestion, twenty-six percent answered negatively, and twenty percent did not reply to the question. For the affirmative answers, the subquestion solicited examples; however, many respondents answering affirmatively did not give the examples requested.

As the subquestions progress from practical research concerns to pure or basic research activities, fewer and fewer respondents replied in the affirmative. In response to a subquestion on the contributions of their research to the knowledge on different learning styles among the students in correspondence educating systems, only twenty-eight percent of the respondents answered affirmatively, fifty-two percent answered negatively, and twenty percent did not reply. It is noted that the positive and negative responses are almost the exact opposite of what they were for the more 'practical' question on the improvement of teaching-learning materials, above.

In response to a subquestion on research activities which seek answer to the 'What if...... or experimental types of question in correspondence educating processes, 'barely twenty-two percent indicated that they do carry on such research, fifty-eight percent indicated that they do not, and again twenty percent did not answer the question. As one respondent who answered it negatively put it, "We need to know 'what is' rather than 'what is' right now." This comment is appropriate, since it is from a system which was started only recently.

Finally, in a subquestion which inquired whether any research activities were directed toward the development of 'theory' on the correspondence educating integral, a very slim ten percent indicated 'yes', seventy-two percent indicated 'no', and eighteen percent did not reply either way. This was the smallest percentage to indicate 'yes', and the largest to indicate 'no', for the questions in the questionnaire.

It is noted that the research activities hover around the 'practical' concerns of correspondence educating processes, and that very few indeed are concerned with 'basic' research as discussed earlier in this chapter. It is not to be concluded, however, that this inquiry represents the whole story on basic research being carried out on correspondence educating systems. The questionnaire for this inquiry was distributed only to professionals in the field, and/or to governmental representatives with decision making authority. This limitation on distribution did not include, for example, master or doctoral degree candidates in universities around the world who may be researching aspects of correspondence educating processes related to the possible development of theory. Furthermore, the distribution of the questionnaire was not made to certain institutions which, at the time of the inquiry, may have been conducting research on correspondence educating processes with the intent to introduce the processes later into their systems.

This is not to imply that a large number of master or doctoral degree candidates are currently researching the theoretical aspects of correspondence educating processes, for they are not. However, there are some.

Similarly, it is not to be concluded that basic research on correspondence educating processes is being carried on extensively in institutions not included in this inquiry, for this is not the case. As a matter of fact, it is now clear that there exists only the barest minimum of research inquiries on the theoretical aspects of correspondence educating processes. Even so, it is true that a beginning has been made.

Over the years, an exceedingly wide range of empirical research of the 'nose-counting' variety has been carried on in correspondence educating systems worldwide. The neologism 'nose-counting' is used to characterize research projects concerned primarily with the number of enrollments, completions, dropouts, etc., in the correspondence educating systems of various societies. In general, such studies delve into a profile description or analysis of the students involved, or the teachers or tutors in the systems, and of the persistence or discontinuance of learners, and the reasons involved. The studies may employ simple statistical techniques such as correlations and chi-square to ferret out certain facets of relations of the 'variables' involved. However, the great majority of these empirical studies to date do not meet the hypothesis-test-control-discuss-conclusion criteria which characterize the scientific inquiry approach described earlier in this chapter.

A careful review of the information compiled by Childs and others, and certainly the findings in this inquiry, indicate the great need for more of the controlled types of experimentation in correspondence educating processes, particularly with the objective of providing "a stable theoretical basis from which hypothesis can be established for additional empirical research." Childs gives at least four reasons why this research is required : "First, there is a need to know what is being done is the best way to do it; secondly, research provides a basis for decision-making purposes; thirdly, through research, and its replication as needed, it can be determined whether certain things which appear to be so really are so; and fourthly, the increasing professionalization of the correspondence educating movement demands that research be carried out rigorously". [In Wedemeyer, ed., 1966, pp. 127-129.]

Faure, *et al.* [1972], close the main body of their study with this proposal : "We propose that agencies assisting education, national and international, private and public, review the present state of 'research and development' in education with a view to strengthening the capacities of individual countries to improve their present educational systems and to invent, design, and test new educational experiments appropriate to their cultures and resources . . ." [p. 263].

This is the final chapter on the principal processes, and what follows next is a synthesis of these processes, with an indication of meaning for the future.

Explicative Synthesis

Throughout this part of the report, the principal correspondence educating processes have been discussed separately for purposes of analysis. However, just as it is unrealistic to separate the aims, objectives, content, media, and methods into discrete categories in the teaching-learning process, so it is artificial to break the chain of policy-making/planning/organizing/ operating/ accrediting/ researching into separate links and leave it there. Clearly, the 'chain' functions as a while, or it does not function at all. Thus, it is the purpose of this brief explicative synthesis to view the principal processes as a functioning, organic whole.

Realistically, even under the best of circumstances, e. g., conviction to act, available funds, qualified staff, etc., the task of creating and sustaining the crucial elements of an effective and efficient correspondence educating system requires the painstaking efforts of dedicated and competent leadership.

Indefinite or fuzzy policy decisions at the outset on the role of the correspondence educating integral in mainstream educating processes will affect adversely the remaining processes in the chain of events required for creating and sustaining the crucial elements of the system. On the other hand, the fewer the malfunctions, the smoother the elements function together as an integrated whole.

In very broad terms, the crucial elements for creating and sustaining a correspondence educating system include, among others, the following : executive management, program development, instruction, instructional resources, logistics, institutional evaluations, and research.

The executive management and/or administrative support for the system includes, among other duties and responsibilities, the planning, fiscal control and accounting, personnel relations, registration, clerical services, and official relations and liaison of the system with schools, colleges, and other off-campus groups and organizations of various kinds in the society.

The program development, promotion, and evaluation element includes assessment of the needs of target clientele and arrangements whereby needs may be met ; it includes also surveys, field investigations, etc concerning societal problems and needs that may be met through the correspondence educating processes.

The instruction element includes a great variety of activities involved in counseling and guidance, and in feed-back/feed-forward relations in the interactive dynamics of the teaching-learning process.

The instructional resources include, among others, mimeographed, printed, electronic, telephonic, programmed and other materials and/or audio-visual devices for communicating over a geographical distance. Included also is the means whereby these various resources may be so structured, both within and among the elements, that learning possibilities for the learner will be optimized, if indeed not maximized. This is to say, 'educational technology' is included also.

The logistics include management of facilities, stocking and distribution of supplies, fiscal matters related to supplies, etc.

The institutional studies include self-analysis and evaluation, as well as outside evaluations designed to extend and improve opportunities to learn in the system.

The basic research involves, principally, the areas of educating processes as they relate to learning by the individual human being about which very little is known at present.

The task of developing and sustaining an effective and efficient correspondence educating system is clearly not one to have done and over with in short order. Rather, there is a continuing need throughout the developing and sustaining activities to gain insight and knowledge from the study and evaluation of other on-going systems, and to use whatever assumptions and methods of such systems as are appropriate within the educational guidelines of the adopting society.

Essentially, then, building a correspondence educating system is institution building, the elements of which are outlined in Chapter 4. And building an institution of whatever kind entails costs, to which attention is given in Part Three, next, in this report.

PART THREE

COSTS CONSIDERATION IN CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATING SYSTEMS

Introduction

This part of the report is concerned with costing correspondence educating processes. Costing is, of course, an economic concept, and thus the background for much of what this part includes is provided in Chapter 5, Cost-Benefit and Cost-Effectiveness, in Part One.

While on rare occasions an in-depth inquiry into the costs of an existing correspondence educating system has been made, there is no instance known to the present inquiry in which the costs of correspondence educating processes have been subjected to rigorous scientific research. In general, the available literature on the subject portrays a pattern in which the costs of correspondence and conventional educating processes are compared. Also in general, the normal conclusion is that correspondence is less costly than conventional educating processes. (Some professionals, however, take issue with a blanket statement on this for *all* circumstances. See, for example, Howard Sheat in the Papers to the 9th ICCE Conference Proceedings, pp. 288-289.)

The rather obvious weakness inherent in the comparison pattern relates to the fact that the vast majority of correspondence educating systems under government auspices are parasitic on the conventional systems concerned. This is to say that correspondence benefits financially from the existence of the conventional educating system.

While the parasitic nature of most correspondence educating systems included in the present inquiry does not mean that their 'hidden' cost is more than that of conventional systems; it does mean that correspondence systems would be more expensive than they are if they had to exist alone. Further, the vast majority of correspondence systems in the present inquiry are either adjuncts or integrals of a larger conventional educating system. This fact further complicates, if indeed it does not make impossible, the separate costing of correspondence educating processes. (Excluded here, of course, are the relatively few proprietary systems participating in this inquiry.)

There is little reason to wonder, then, at the fact that the lack of rigorous costing of correspondence educating processes is one of the most glaring weaknesses noted in this inquiry. If costing the conventional educating system is complex and difficult, which, of course, it is, then costing the correspondence educating process as an adjunct or integral of that system can but be equally as difficult, or even more so. For this and other reasons suggested above, correspondence educating processes are not costed out generally with any discernible consistent pattern or patterns. This is evident in the responses received to this inquiry.

A distinction is required between correspondence educating processes under government auspices and those under proprietorship. Whereas government financed correspondence systems are generally adjuncts or integrals of larger educating systems, proprietary correspondence systems stand alone normally and the costing procedures are more in accord with those of other commercial enterprises. The large majority of respondents to this inquiry are in systems under government authorization.

Part Three consists of one chapter on recurrent costs.

Chapter 13

Recurrent Costs

For an inquiry of this nature, it was necessary from the outset to define what is meant by recurrent costs.

Recurrent costs are defined to include the following : Salaries for teaching and non-teaching staffs ; student services (advisory, lesson assignments and corrections, and/or guidance) ; administration ; textbook materials from publishers (shelf stock) ; authors and editors of courseware ; printing of specifically prepared textbook and syllabi materials ; postage ; promotion and/or marketing ; and other elements as specified by respondents. Against each of these categories respondents were requested to indicate where the costs would fall : Costs borne by central authority ? By state or province? By city or other local sources? By the learner ? Or by foreign aid? Respondents were requested also to identify the unit of currency for any monetary amounts shown.

The basic question asked was this: What are the annual recurrent costs of your correspondence educating system ?

Twenty-five respondents supplied recurrent costs information and data in sufficient detail to warrant inclusion in this chapter. However cautionary comments were provided by respondents on the *gross* nature of the estimates supplied. Further, only a small minority of respondents supplied the full body of information aud data called for, apparently because the information and data were not available readily.

The monetary amounts supplied by the respondents were in terms of their own currencies, e. g., Franc, Mark, Rupee, NZ $, Kina, Kwacha, A $, etc. These currencies were all converted to the U. S. dollar equivalents. The *proportionate* costs borne by the learners and government units for the recurrent costs items are not changed by this conversion.

Recurrent costs stand out normally as the prominent concern in the planning, programming, and budgeting for correspondence educating processes.

Students are required to bear part of the expenses of the materials and services rendered in most correspondence educating systems.

The amounts and percentages of dollars expended for each of the recurrent costs vary over a wide range. In particular, it is found that of all recurrent costs, 54. 4 percent is for salaries ; 12. 7 percent is for student services; 10.6 percent is for administration; 5.4 percent is for textbook materials (shelf stock) ; 5. 3 percent is for authors and editors ; 4. 4 percent is for printing ; 4. 2 percent is for postage ; 1. 3 percent is for promotion ; and 1.7 percent is for other items (including vehicles, office equipment, refunds, etc.).

Thus, it is that salaries are the largest of the recurrent costs. When salaries for teaching and non-teaching staffs are combined with the salaries for administration, the total percentage for salaries is a little less than two-thirds (65 percent) of the total dollar amount available for all recurrent costs purposes. This finding is not unique, of course, since it accords with the well-known fact that the teaching profession generally is labor-intensive, and teaching within a correspondence educating system is no exception to the general pattern in this regard. It should not be concluded from this, however, that all respondents to this inquiry expend two-thirds of their available dollars for teaching and administration activities, for this is not the case. For example, the percentages for the institutions, when considered individually, range from a high of 92 percent to a low of 10 percent for salaries, with a wide range of variations in between these two extremes.

It should be cautioned, also, that the extreme variations in percentages for salaries can be misleading. For example, not all respondents interpreted salaries in the same way. In some institutions the markers or graders of the academic work of student are classified under the students services caption, rather than under the teaching staff caption. If this is done, then it is clear that the percentage of salaries for the teaching staff category will be reduced, and the percentage of expenditure for students services will be increased.

Further, the work of authors, editors, and contract writers is considered to be the same as non-teaching staff work by some institutions. When this is the case, the salaries for authors, etc., are included under the teaching and non-teaching caption. This, of course, introduces an additional factor for consideration in trying to arrive at a pattern or set of patterns of the general behavior in this area.

What is true in this regard about salaries is true also about others of the recurrent costs item captions. Institutions differ in their decisions on what to include or not include the captions, although the differences with respect to salaries are greater than the differences for any of the other captions iudicated.

Thus, institutions differ with regard to budgeting not only on a worldwide basis, such as concerns this inquiry, but they differ as well even in the same system, not to mention budgeting differences among the departments or faculties within the same institution. Thus, the differences noted in this inquiry are neither surprising nor unique: They merely confirm what is known generally and accepted as the norm. What is somewhat surprising in this inquiry, however, is the extent to which there are areas of substantial agreement, even on a worldwide basis, on how the costs are borne for correspondence educating processes.

Of the total costs for teaching and non-teaching staffs, 85.2 percent is borne by the central authority; 0.3 percent is borne by the state or province; and 14.5 percent is borne by the students. Clearly then, the central authority bears the major proportion of the recurrent costs for salaries for these institutions, with the students bearing the second highest proportion. The salary costs borne by students derive primarily from those public institutions which are self-supporting, and from the private but non-proprietary institutions included in these systems.

Not all institutions can isolate salary schedules for teachers in correspondence from those for teachers in other areas of the educating system. This is particulary the case for some integrated complex univerisity settings. As one respondent put it, "Recurrent costs are borne by the Australian Government which allocates funds for both purposes through the Universities Commission. States no longer share these costs, nor do students, since tuition fees were abolished in 1974.

"Salaries for *teaching staff* cannot be easily separated into internal and external activities because staff in three faculties are appointed to share in both forms of teaching......"[New England University, Australia]

With reference to costs for students services, 75.7 percent is borne by the central authority; 7.0 percent is borne by the state or province; and 17.3 percent is borne by the students. Here again the central authority has the largest proportionate cost, with that of the students ranking second. It is noted that the costs borne by the state or province for this cost item is higher than what it was for the salaries dissussed above. And again, also, the costs borne by the students reflect the presence of public self-supporting and private non-proprietary systems among the institutions.

It is not to be concluded that there is uniformity of agreement among the reporting institutions on the meaning of student services, for this is not the case. For the purpose of this inquiry, student services are defined to include a variety of *support* services for the instructional processes, such as advisory services, the handling or processing of lessons and assignments, record keeping activities, counseling and guidance, and so on. These services are essential for proficiency in educating systems generally, and they are particularly so in the large and complex systems.

However, some institutions do not define teaching and support services in the ways suggested by this inquiry. Instead, there is a mixture of the two in such a manner that they cannot be separated easily for purposes of analysis. It appears that the smaller systems are particularly prone to forgo the clear and distinct separation of the two functions, although this is not the case universally. In any event, and for purposes of this report, the separation was made whenever the information and data supplied by respondents was in sufficient detail to permit this. In most cases, the definitions in this report are in agreement with those of the reporting institutions.

With reference to costs for administration, 52.7 percent is borne by the central authority ; 8 . 0 percent is borne by the state or province, 6.0 percent is borne by the city or other local source; 33.3 percent is borne by the students. Thus, it is seen that the costs of management in these institutions are more widely borne by the different units of government than are the costs of the teaching staffs discussed earlier. Further, the costs borne by students for management are 38 percent greater than the costs student bear for student services.

However, these expenditures on administration for all institutions combined do not reflect, necessarily, the practices of the institutions when they are considered individually. For example, in many systems the students bear none of the costs of administration (just as is true, also, for salaries and student services discussed above), while in other self-supporting public and private non-proprietary systems included in these systems students bear all the costs.

Further, also as with salaries and student services, the percentage range of expenditures on administration varies widely among these institutions considered individually : the percentage expenditures range from a low of 3 percent to a high of 30 percent. And again, these extremes for expenditures on administration can be misleading if they are taken out of the context of the systems concerned.

With reference to costs for textbook materials, 10 percent is borne by the central authority, and 90 percent is borne by the students. Thus, the costs for shelf stock textbook materials fall largely on the students, and not on the central or state authority as in cases of salaries, student services, and administration above. This finding is not unexpected, of course, since it is well known that in many correspondence educating systems students are required to purchase their own textbooks. However, this is not true for all institutions reporting.

In some correspondence educating systems, textbook materials are supplied without cost to the students, Further, in other systems only part-time students buy their own textbook materials. Finally, the professionals in still other systems eschew the utilization of shelf stock textbook materials in their correspondence educating processes, either on the principle that such shelf stock textbooks are prepared normally for use in the classroom setting, or simply because no shelf stock textbook meets the substantive needs of the course or program concerned. For this last group, the major costs would be for authors and editors, and for the printing of specially prepared materials, as discussed below.

With regard to costs for authors and editors, 55.6 percent is borne by the central authority; 4.5 percent is borne by the state or proyince; 38.6 percent is borne by the students; and 1.3 percent is borne by foreign aid. Here again the costs are borne principally by the central authority, with the costs borne by students ranking second. However, as in the case of the other cost items, the combined costs pattern belies the variegated costs patterns which exist among the institutions when they are analyzed individually.

It is not to be concluded, for example, that all correspondence educating systems are required to meet the costs of all authors and editors in their systems, for this is not the case. In some integrated systems the services of authors and editors are part of the regularly assigned responsibilities of the professionals concerned, and thus the direct costs for these services are nil. Thus, in these systems, only the costs for authors and editors outside the permanent or regular teaching staffs are provided. However, it is clear that the costs of authors and editors must include, realistically, both the costs implicit in the salaries of the regular faculty concerned as well as the explicit costs of outside qualified persons.

With reference to costs for printing specially prepared materials, 64.9 percent is borne by the central authority; 1.9 percent is borne by the state or province; 30.5 percent is borne by the students; and 2.7 percent is borne by foreign aid. Thus, again, the central authority bears the largest percentage of the costs, with the students second in line.

Printing is the final phase in the preparation and production of specially designed teaching-learning materials. However, this does not mean that there is necessarily a one-to-one relation between the proportionate costs of authors and editors and the costs of printing, for this is not the case. It would be expected, for example, that in integrated institutions where the regular or permanent faculties write the materials, and where the cost of this writing is not isolated in salary schedules, the discrepancy between the proportionate costs of writing and printing would be pronounced. And this is indeed the case when the institutions are considered individually. Thus, it is that some institutions indicate nil for writing costs but expend a considerable sum annually for printing the materials written by faculties.

With reference to costs for postage, 44.3 percent is borne by the central authority; 2.2 percent is borne by the state or province; and 53.5 percent is borne by the students. Thus, for this item the costs to the students rank first by a small margin, and the costs to the central authority rank second.

As with other recurrent cost items, the institutions differ widely, when considered individually, on where the costs for postage fall. In some systems, the students bear no costs whatever for postage; it is provided as official "free" postage for the non-contiguous students; in other systems, the costs of postage are shared by the students and the central authority; and in still other systems, the students at a distance from the institution bear all the costs of postage. This variegated pattern does not mean that the non-contiguous students bear the cost of postage in an excessively large percentage of the systems, for this is not the case. For example, when the 44.3 percent borne by the central authority is added to the 2.2 percent borne by the state or province, the resulting 46.5 percent indicates that in a little less than half the systems all costs of postage for the students at a distance are paid by the central or state authorities. This is the case for the systems considered individually, as well as combined.

With reference to costs for promotion and marketing, 27.1 percent is borne by the central authority ; 2.8 percent is borne by the state or province ; and 70.1 percent is borne by the students. What appears to be an anomaly occurs here : the students in public and private non-proprietary institutions bear the heaviest costs of promotion and marketing. However, the situation is not as anomalous as it appears, if it is taken in context.

Students bear the costs of promotion and marketing in the public self-supporting and private non-proprietary institutions. These institutions tend to expend larger amounts annually on promotion than the integrated and other non-self-supporting institutions. Thus, it is that while the self-supporting and private non proprietary institutions are not themselves disproportionately represented in the inquiry, the amounts and percentages of dollars expended on promotion are in disproportion to the dollar amounts and percentages spent by the other types of institutions included.

It can be said, then, that not all institutions have promotion and marketing costs ; that the costs for promotion and marketing are borne by the central authority in integrated and non-self-supporting institutions, and are borne by the students in self-supporting and private non-proprietary institutions ; and that the total costs of promotion and marketing for all institutions combined is relatively small.

With reference to 'other recurrent costs, 26.6 percent is borne by the central authority, and 73.4 percent is borne by the students. Here again is an apparent anomalous situation, with the students bearing the major portion of a miscellany of costs items ; office equipment, supplies, vehicles, travel, refunds, etc. However, these and other miscellaneous recurrent costs items fall upon the students for the reasons cited above in regard to promotion and marketing. That is to say, the costs of 'other' items are borne by students in self-supporting and private non-proprietary institutions, and not by students in the other types of institutions included.

The systems analyzed in this chapter portray a wide range of behaviors with reference to recurrent costs procedures and expenditures. This is true for these institutions whether they are combined into categories selected arbitrarily, or whether the institutions are compared on an individual basis. The very fact that these differences in procedures and expenditures exist is indicative that all correspondence educating systems may not be placed within a single grouping, if a meaningful analysis of the recurrent costs variables involved is to be made. There simply is no such thing as a single recurrent costs pattern equally applicable to all correspondence educating systems alike. In view of this, perhaps the prime contribution of this section of the report is the re-emphasis it gives to the need to pay close attention to the variations that exist both among and within correspondence educating systems in recurrent costs procedures and practices.

What appears to be the missing element in costing educating systems in general, and in costing correspondence systems in particular, is the keeping of accurate records, systematically, of the costs of materials and services in such a manner that analysis of recurrent cost items can be made, and that a follow-through with a synthesis of the findings can be such as to provide realistic guidelines for arriving at cost estimates for the purpose of planning and budgeting. The results of this inquiry indicate that this missing element is one characteristic of the majority of correspondence educating systems.

PART FOUR

COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES

Introduction

In one sense, and in accordance with the terms of reference for this report, this Part Four may be viewed as a separate unit from the other three preceding parts. While the preceding three parts are directed primarily, though not exclusively, to a target audience of authorities with overall policy decision-making powers, this Part Four is intended primarily, though again not exclusively, for the practicing professional in correspondence educating processes. The central focus is on the educational context within which communications technologies may be utilized by professionals in the field.

On the other hand, it is both awkward, sequentially speaking, and unrealistic, substantively speaking, to separate entirely consideration of the practical utilization of communications technologies from the authoritative policy-making processes for the educating system as an integrated whole. Thus, although the one chapter of this Part Four may be viewed as a separate composite unit, the full import of this chapter can be comprehended only within the context of the report as a whole. The frequent references required throughout this Part Four to chapters in other parts of the report are indicative of the integrative relationships existing among the various parts.

In the more familiar approach, the new communications technologies are largely supplementary to the two primary media of instruction ; the textbook and the teacher. In this approach, as is well known, it is often the case that the existing curricula and teaching techniques are not changed or altered. but merely translated into the newer media. What this amounts to, then, is the use of communication technologies as add-ons or appendages to supplement or complement the ongoing educating processes.

This approach is by far the most widely found at present in correspondence educating practices. In practice, this approach results frequently in a somewhat piecemeal use of communications devices whenever funds or other relevant circumstances or resources permit. There may or may not be systematic planning for the use of such devices in the educating system.

In a second and less familiar but emerging approach, the primary concern is with". . . a systematic way of designing, carrying out, and evaluating the total process of learning and teaching in terms of specific objectives, based on research in human learning and communication, and employing a combination of human and nonhuman resources to bring about more effective instruction" [Snider in Tickton, ed., 1970, p. 21]. In this radically different approach, the curricula and teaching techniques derive from the systematically developed design. The primary concern is with the educating system as an organic integrated whole.

This systematic way of designing, carrying out, evaluating and improving the whole system is, in essence, a technology. That is, by specific definition, it is the organized use of methods and materials to achieve clearly identified objectives. As applied to commerce or industry, technology is clearly directed toward commercial or industrial objectives. However, when applied in the development of a system of education, technology is just as clearly directed toward educational objectives. That is to say, it is an educational technology. It is this educational technology concept that provides the framework for this part of the report.

Chapter 14

Utilization Practices

The tenor and tone for this chapter can be expressed best by a quotation from a publication by Hutchins [1968] : "Every educational system is a technology. It aims to turn out the kind of 'product' the community wants" [p. 12]. In this chapter, the educational system is viewed as a technology, and the elements of the technology are outlined. This perspective provides the framework or context within which communications technologies are utilized.

Technological devices of various kinds are being used on an increasing scale for transmitting information between learners and teachers. These communications technologies have increased with such dramatic force within relatively recent years that fascination with them and with their potential for educating purposes is practically universal. Indeed, as Schramm states it, "The tools are so fascinating that we have tended to watch them develop and marvel at them and to neglect the more mundane and messier questions of how to use them" [in Tickton, ed., 1970, p. 23].

It is understandable that, with this fascination, a 'gadget' approach to the technical possibilities of the 'newer media' dominated much of the recently past fifteen or twenty years. The major emphasis during these years seems to have been on the introduction and operation of 'hardware' devices as devices with only limited reference to their total integration with systematically predetermined procedures for the improvement of learning by the learner. In some cases, it appears that technological 'gadgetry' was appended to on-going educating processes almost solely on the basis of the enthusiasm of the policy-makers for such devices and on the availability of funds in the system.

However, with the increasing concerns of educating larger segments of the population in many societies, coupled with the concomitant need to personalize teaching-learning processes so far as practicable, there is a gradual emergence in many societies of procedures somewhat analogous to a systems approach in the development of learning environments. In this approach, communications technologies constitute only one set of elements, among many others, in the systematic efforts to design, produce, implement, evaluate, and improve effective teaching-learning situations.

Viewed in this perspective, the communications technologies could function as integrals for the individualization and democratization of teaching-learning processes. That is, as Dieuzeide [1971] puts it, the communications media could function to "optimize the learning process" [P.1]. Or, again, as Faure, *et al.* [1972] states it, optimistically, the "new communications technologies have made it possible to develop new patterns of instruction, such as open systems and self-services" [p. 111]. These and other optimistic viewpoints provide broadly based challenges which have as yet to be met successfully by the educating systems of most societies.

For, in the final analysis and synthesis, technology in education, i.e. , the utilization of communications technologies in the educating process, is for the learner, and "The time is far off . . . when we can identify an instructional problem, then faultlessly select the proper instructional mix to solve it" [Allen (1975), p. 28].

Admittedly, present knowledge can describe but cannot explain learning in the human organism. Nevertheless, learning can be recognized clearly when it takes place. This, then, must be the key at present for judging the efficacy of whatever teaching-learning strategy, or of whatever technique within a strategy, is used. "The Commission took as the starting point of its study not technology, but learning. The heart of education is the student learning, and the value of any technology used in education must therefore be measured by its capacity to improve learning" [Tickton, *et al.* , *op. cit.* , *P. 9*].

Today, with the advent of the educational technology concept, attention is being focused increasingly on the actual outcomes of as well as on the inputs to the educating system. That is to say, there is a growing concern with what quality of educational output is obtained from the use of what types of input, and why. Although the definitive answers are for the future, the gadget era has all but passed ; new 'hardware' media are no longer used indiscriminately without any reference to their probable efficacy for the educational output intended.

Clearly, then, the utilization of communications technology can no longer be an after-thought, add-on basis, if the utilization is to be in accord with gradually emerging trends. The impact of utilization of these media is pervasive within the system, and a clear authorizing policy is required for the follow-through with curriculum and course design, and with the subsequent teaching-learning interactions among teachers, media, and learners.

Just as clearly, however, there remain too many unanswered questions on precisely *what* media are most effective and efficient for the achievement of *which* educational goals or objectives for the full potentials to be realized at present. Each communication technology has its own characteristics. At the decision-making level for utilization, therefore, a largely subjective choice must be made on which characteristics or combination of characteristics are most likely to be effective for the teaching-learning ends in view, and the appropriate media selected and utilized accordingly.

The basic question asked of prospective respondents on this aspect of the inquiry was this : "What communications technologies do you use in your correspondence educating system and with what justification ?" This basic question was followed, as in all other basic questions in the inquiry, by a series of subquestions designed to elicit more specific responses than could be given to the overall basic question. The following analysis is patterned largely, although not exclusively, on the responses given to each of the series of subquestions.

The effective and efficient utilization of newer communications media depends to a large extent upon an understanding throughout the system of the policy guidelines for such utilization. Thus, respondents were asked at the outset to indicate and comment on the availability of "working guidelines governing the use of communications technologies in the correspondence educating systems." Only twenty-two percent indicated yes, seventy percent indicated no, and eight percent did not respond to the question.

Thus, only about one in each five respondents indicated the availability of overall guidelines or policy statements for utilizing newer communications media in their correspondence educating systems. Decision-making on the use of the newer communications media may depend upon the desires or attitudes of the faculty involved, as well as upon availability and cost factors.

Generalizations are most difficult for this area, but two observations of a general nature seem warranted. First, it is noted that as one moves down the line from authorizing to operationalizing levels, guidelines for media utilization must be particularized for the level being served. For example, while the authorizing guidelines set the general tone, tenor, and boundaries for media utilization, and allow generally for unforeseen contingencies, operationalizing guidelines require *specific* concern for *which* media to use for *what* educational purposes in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, and cost considerations. That is, the guideline perspectives differ at the different levels in the system.

Secondly, and basically, at whatever level the guidelines for newer media utilization are provided, there must be consistency among the levels (1) on the extent to which mechanical or electronic devices may be employed, (2) on the ground rules for such employment, and (3) on the facilities and/or arrangements and support available for media utilization. These would seem to constitute the minimum general criteria for the development of guidelines throughout the educating system.

It is clear, then, that appropriate guidelines are required of all levels for the utilization of communications media in the educating system. The professionals in the field are keenly aware of this requirement. However, at present, in many cases, the need is for *top-level authorizing* guidelines. As one respondent expressed it: "These matters are in flux, with nothing written at present". In the large majority of cases the over-riding constraints of availability and costs prevent even a limited general policy statement, to say nothing of the development of guidelines for the utilization of newer media.

Briefly, there is the absence of scientifically-based research upon which to make judgments on (1) *which* media are most effective for (2) *what* educational outcomes in respect to (3) *which* categories of learners. Two questions were included in the inquiry to provide opportunities for respondents to react to this pervasively perennial concern in educating processes generally.

The one question put to prospective respondents was this : "Do you have access to research information and data for your decision-making process on what communications technologies are most effective for specified or defined purposes in correspondence educating processes ?"

The 'yes' and 'no' responses to this subquestion were, surprisingly, not too far apart : Fifty percent indicated yes, forty-two percent indicated no, and eight percent did not respond to the question. Thus, one in each two respondents indicated access to research information and data for the decision-making process on the effectiveness of various communications technologies. However, merely 'having access' to available research information and data does not mean that all didactical questions on media utilization are answered for the professional in the field, for this is not the case.

The second comparison subquestion put to prospective respondents on access to research information and data was this : "Do you have access to research information and data on what communications technologies are most effective in terms of the interest, effort, and progress of learners in correspondence educating processes in any of the following categories : in-school youth, out-of-school youth, working adults, non-working adults, others (specify) ?" This subquestion, like the other 'access' subquestion discussed above, has not been researched enough systematically, if indeed at all, for the needed answers to be in. Its inclusion in the inquiry, again like the one above, was to provide respondents the opportunity to indicate any *generally unknown* research projects in this area. The responses were not entirely surprising : Sixty-two percent indicated no, twenty-eight percent indicated yes, and ten percent did not respond to the question. Thus, three out of each five respondents indicated that they do not have such information and data as asked for in the question.

Again, 'having access' simply means being able to keep abreast of research findings; it does not mean that definitive answers are available from these findings. In actual practice, this means that the professional can use available objective information and data to supplement or even support the largely subjective judgments that must be made at present on media selection and utilization. Thus, it is that the professional with access to research findings has whatever advantage this access affords in the decision-making process for newer media utilization in the teaching-learning situation.

There are distinct advantages in using the experiences of teachers and learners in the decision-making process on media utilization. However, certain precautions are required. The responses indicate that in some cases discretion on the use of newer media is left almost entirely with the course writer, with only a few general guidelines given on possibilities and constraints. Although this arrangement may be satisfactory for certain of the course or program writers, the wider experience suggests that most neophyte course writers are in need of specific assistance from knowledgeable personnel in this area. This is true even though the course writer may be an experienced classroom teacher. While few of the respondents' institutions are prepared to go the full distance of employing educational technology staffs, there is the option used by some of employing on an ad hoc basis the expertise required. In some of the less industrialized nations, for instance, knowledgeable expatriates aid in this area.

Although there is much yet to learn about the characteristics of various communications media vis-a-vis the characteristics of learners, the increasing amount of material published in this general area is supplementing, at least to some extent, the heretofore complete reliance on "rule of thumb," "good judgment," and "common sense" as the *only* available means of deciding on what media to use. In the final synthesis, of course, both good judgment and common sense are required in any decision-making process, but objective information and data derived from rigorous research provide the firm basis for a decision to expend limited funds on expensive communications media. Thus, there is urgent need for much more rigorous research than is evidenced in literature.

A concern of the inquiry was to learn to what extent communications media generally are integrated in correspondence educating processes. The sub-question put to prospective respondents was this : "Are your communications technologies planned integrals of of your system, or are they not planned integrals but are superimposed on your on-going correspondence educating processes?" The results were about what was expected. Thirty-six percent indicated yes, thirty percent indicated no, and twenty-two present indicated that they have some of both. Twelve percent did not respond to the question. Thus, the *yes* and *no* answers are not far apart, and about one in each five respondents stated that they both integrate and do not integrate media utilization.

There is an apparent shift away from a fascination with media per se to a concern for the needs of learners for greater individualized learning opportunities. This shift in thinking appears to be symptomatic of the deeper re-direction of formal schooling attitudes towards the teaching-learning process. The apparent re-direction in attiudes is from one of teachers teaching to one of learners learning. This change in attitudes is gradual and is by no means universal, but both the results of this inquiry and a review of relevant literature indicate that the shift in attitudes is taking place.

The change in attitudes has implications also for the possible new role or function of newer media in the teaching-learning situation. There is at present no evidence that any medium, whether traditional or newer, is generally superior to all others for teaching-learning purposes. On the contrary, experimental evidence is that learners learn from any medium. Thus it is that the newer media can enhance and extend learning opportunities.

As Schramm [1972] states it, "Given a reasonably favorable situation, a pupil will learn from any medium—television, radio, programmed instruction, film, filmstrips, or others. This has been demonstrated by hundreds of experiments. In general, the same things that control the amount of learning from a teacher face-to-face also control the amount of learning from educational media ; among others, the ralevance and clarity of the content, individual abilities, motivation to learn, attention, interest in the subject, respect for and affection for the teacher, emphasis and replication of central points to be learnt, and rehearsal by the learner" [pp. 44-79].

With these and other changing attitudes and behaviors increasingly in evidence, it seems reasonable to conclude that the present gradual trend to plan, produce, implement, evaluate, and improve the teaching-learning situation as an integrated, organic whole, utilizing both human and non-human resources as required for the educational objectives in view, can but be indicative of a dominant pattern for the future. As one respondent stated, the case for one pattern currently in use, "the whole programme for a subject is integrated—lectures (printed), films, slides, audio tapes, telephone calls, lecturer visits, etc," [Adelaide College of Advanced Education, South Australia]

To what extent are tapes, television, radio, etc., being used ? The subquestion to prospective respondents on this aspect of the inquiry was designed to obtain information on utilization and on the reason for utilization. The subquestion is as follows : "Do you use any of the following communications technologies in your correspondence educating processes ? (If yes, place a check mark next to each one you use and add others as needed. Please state primary reason for use in each case.)" This subquestion was followed immediately by these choices for checking as directed : slides, films, tapes, cassettes, telephones, radio, radiovision, television, language laboratories, computers, satellites, others (specify). While practically all respondents complied with the request on what media are utilized, wherever they are used, all did not comply with the request on the reason for utilization.

Communications technologies are in wide use among respondents to this inquiry. Eighty-two percent indicated that they use communications media, fourteen percent indicated that they do not, and four percent did not reply to the question. Thus, at least four out of each five respondents use communications media of one form or another.

This wide usage is indicated, despite the lack of overall working guidelines among seventy percent of the respondents, as noted earlier.

Communications technologies are not all used to the same extent among the respondents ; there is a clear rank order of utilization. This rank order, in terms of percentage of utilization as reported by respondents, is as follows : 72% of the respondents use cassettes ; 46% use tapes ; 42% use slides : 28% use films ; also 28% use the telephone ; 26% use television ; 24% use radio ; 20% use the computer : 10% use a language laboratory ; and 18% other media (discs, kits, newpapers, etc.). Radiovision and satellites were not reported in use by any respondent. (It is known, however, that radiovision and satellites are in use in areas not responding to this inquiry.)

The communications devices in use cover a wide range : from those useful for the individualization of the teaching-learning process to those intended primarily for 'mass' distribution of educational messages. The educational purposes for which the devices are employed range from the purely 'academic' purposes to 'mass conscientization' on health such as that in Tanzania, for example. (See 10th ICCE Conference Papers pp. 101-105.)

In some cases, institutional, financial, social, or political circumstances, or even. personal choice, may result in commitment to only one of the many devices available, e. g., radio or television, even though the present trend is to utilize media in combination whenever this is thought to be required and wherever it is possible to do so.,

The growth of 'personalized media' (e. g., the periodical, the telephone, the audio cassette, the video tape or disc, etc.) as distinct from 'mass media' (e. g., the radio the television the newspaper, etc.) has generated a concept of 'narrowcasting' vis-a-vis broadcasting in practice and in the literature. In norrowcasting, personalized media are used for "communication to, and between, members of specialist subsets of the community"; in broadcasting, by contrast, mass media are used for communication. The concept of narrowcasting with its implications for educating processes was outlined in a paper presented by Professor Broadbent at the 1974 International Conference on Frontiers in Education, Venue, University College, London. In that paper (entitled

"An Australian Postgraduate Open University-Television University VITU, Radio University VL2UV") Professor Broadbent documents that "the growth of personalized media is outstripping the growth rate of mass media by an order of magnitude."

While validated guidelines for the effective and efficient utilization of newer communications media are yet to be developed, it is possible at persent, based upon a wide range of practices and procedures, to suggest a few general ideas which may serve as useful points of reference in the policy decision-making process on what media to utilize. These generalized ideas have been gleaned from responses to this inquiry, but principally from the literature.

To begin, there must be an educational course, project, or program with a clearly articulated overall purpose and configuration. This precedes the spelling out of objectives and all the rest. This initial requirement is so obvious that it is overlooked frequently by course designers anxious to get on with delineating objectives. The overall purpose and configuration of a program to aid farmers increase the yield of crops per acre differs distinctly from that of a first-year course in the French language, to say nothing of the specfic objectives developed subsequently for these two educational projects.

With the educational course, program, or project clearly defined in terms of overall purpose, then the specific objectives to be achieved by the learner can be detailed, and the means of achieving the objectives developed. Presumably, some of the objectives will be achieved through the utilization of one or more of the newer communications media. This is the only basis for the need to use these media ; they facilitate the learner's acquirement of the learning objectives. As Morgan [1971] states it : "The cornerstone of instructional technology is the proposition that the goals of education and training can be operationally defined in terms of learner performance" [in Tickton, ed., p. 781].

An institutional 'atmosphere' hospitable to the utilization of newer media is required for optimum success. Dietrich and Johnson [1970] observe that "the successful introduction of educational technology into any institution must be judged against existing operational patterns and specific problems facing the institution" [in Tickton, ed., p, 467].

The participation and support of the teaching staff are required for the utilization of the newer communication media. "The crux of the matter,", says Stevin Ryan [1970], "is the understanding of the true nature of technology. Technology offers us a *new perspective* on the problem of the structure of learning, and the ability to utilize the technology will correlate highly to the teacher's ability to define purposeful activity, activity which is systematic, rational, and meaningful" [in Tickton, ed., p, 379].

An arrangement is required for the continuing evaluation and improvement of effectiveness of the various media in use, and for the elimination of those which do not contribute measurably to the achievement of the intended educational goals.

A basic requirement for the utilization of newer media, of course, is the support of the top-level educational leadership in the institution and/or the society. The literature is replete with documentary evidence of this basic requirement.

It appears reasonable to conclude, then, that decisions on the utilization of communications media should be made only after first-hand inquiry into some of the current practices and procedures relevant to a given situation or setting, and after a try-out and evaluation of such practices on a limited scale in terms of accessibility, comparative cost/effectiveness and cost/benefit (see Chapter 5), and other factors affecting the utilization of media in the institution or society concerned. The state of the art at present is such that the guidelines derived through this trial and error approach can serve as well as any others in a given teaching-learning situation.

Postscript

Finally, then, the report endeavors to emphasize the importance of structure throughout ; It emphasizes the fundamental idea in the educating process for the individual learner; it discusses and analyzes correspondence educating processes in terms of the structured pattern of this fundamental idea; it makes continuing references to the conventional ‘‘model,’ as similar to, and yet different from, the correspondence integral of the educating process for the individual learner; and it reexamines frequently the inter-relationships existing among the concepts and elements involved in the educating processes.

The worthwhileness of the structural strategy used in this report must be judged ultimately, as for any other correspondence educating strategy, in terms of the effectiveness and efficiency of the learning out-comes for the individual decision-makers concerned.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Abridged)

The UNESCO-ICCE Inquiry into Correspondence Educating Processes *African Correspondence Institutions : A Survey.* Cambridge, England : International Extension College, April, 1972.

Allen, William H. "Intellectual Abilities and Instructional Media Design." *A V Communication Review,* Vol. 23, No. 2, Summer, 1975, pp. 139-170.

Beeby, C. E. *Qualitative Aspects of Educational Planning.* Paris : UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) 1969.

Bereday, George Z.F.; Brickman, William W.; and Read, Gerald H.; eds. *The Changing Soviet School.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press, 1960.

Bertalanffy, Ludwig von. *General System Theory* (Foundation, Development, Application). New York, New York : George Braziller, 1968.

Blase, Melvin. *Institution Building : A Source Book.* Beverly Hills, California : Sage Publications, 1973.

Blaug, M. "Approaches to Educational Planning." *Economic Journal,* Vol. 77 June, 1967, pp. 262-287.

Blaug, Mark. *A Cost-Benefit Approach to Educational Planning in Developing Countries :* IBRD, Economics Department Staff study EC-157, December, 1967.

Blaug Mark. *An Introduction to the Economics of Education.* London, England : Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 1970.

Bloom, Benjamin S., *et al. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives.* New York/ London : Longmans, Green and Company, 1956.

Brimer, M. A., and Pauli, L. *Wastage in Education* (A World Problem), Paris/Geneva: UNESCO, 1971.

Bruner, Jerome S. *The Process of Education.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Budgeting, Programme Analysis and Cost-Effectiveness in Educational Planning. Technical Reports. Paris, France: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1968.

Cawley, R. W. ; Miller, Sheila; Milligan, James N. "Cognitive Styles and the Adult Learner." *Adult Education,* Vol. XXVI, No. 2, 1976, pp. 101-116.

Childs, Gayle B. "Problems of Teaching by Correspondence." *Report of the Conference on Newer Media in Correspondence Study.* Austin, Texas : University of Texas, 1962.

Chirikos, Thomas N., and Wheeler, A.C.R. "Concepts and Teachniques of Educational Planning." *Review of Educational Research,* Vol. XXXVIII, No. 3, June, 1968, pp. 265-275.

Cohen, Rosalie, "Conceptual Styles, Culture Conflict and Non-Verbal Tests of Intelligence." *American Anthropologist,* Vol. VII, 1969, pp. 828-856.

Cros, L. *Correspondence Education in France.* Strasbourg, France : Council of Europe, 1968.

Dieuzeide, Henri. *Educational Technology and Development of Education.* Paris : UNESCO, 1970.

Dieuziede, Henri. *Educational Technology: Sophisticated, Adapted, and Rational Technology.* Paris : UNESCO, 1971.

Dohmen, Gunther. "Media Selection and Media Research." *Media/ Methods.* European Home Study Council, Autumn Conference, Oslo, Norway, 1973, pp. 127-128.

Edstrom, Lars-Olaf; Erdos, Renee; and Prosser, Roy, eds. *Mass Education.* Stockholm : Almquist & Wiksell, 1970.

El-Bushra, Judy. *Correspondence Training at University.* Cambridge, England : International Extension College, 1973.

Elements of Educational Planning. Paris : UNESCO, 1963.

Erdos, Renee F. *Teaching by Correspondence.* London : Longmans, Green Limited, 1967.

Faure, Edgar, *et al.* *Learning to Be.* Paris : UNESCO, 1972.

Gagne, Robert M. *The Conditions of Learning.* New York, New York : Holt. Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1965.

Gagne, Robert M. "Learning Research and Its Implications for Independent Learning." *The Theory and Nature of Independent Learning.*
Edited by Gerald T, Gleason. Scranton, Pennsylvania ; International Textbook Co., 1967.

Gagne, Robert M. "Learning Theory, Educational Media and Individualized Instruction." *Educational Broadcasting Review,* Vol. 4, No. 3, 1970, pp. 49-62.

Glatter, Ron, and Wedell, E. G. *Study by Correspondence.* London : Longmans, Green Limited, 1970.

Harris, David. "Educational Technology at the Open University. A Short History of Achievement and Cancellation." *British Journal of Educational Technology,* Vol. 7, No. 1, January, 1976, pp. 43-53.

Harris, W. J. A. *The Distance Tutor—Education by Correspondence.* Manchester, England : The University of Manchester, July, 1975.

Holmberg, Borge. *Status and Trends of Distance Education.* Hagen Studies in Distance Education, No. 1, 1976. Fernuniversitat Hagen.

Holmberg, Borge. *Studies in Education by Correspondence—A Bibliography.* Malmo, Sweden : Hermods, 1968.

Hovey, Richard L. "Cognitive Style in African Cultures : The Global-Articulated Dimension". Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1971.

Hutchins; Robert M. *The Learning Society.* New York/London : Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968.

Inbar, Dan. "Organizational Patterns of Educational Planning". *Comparative Education,* Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 73-81.

Kabwasa, A., and Kaunda, M. *Correspondence Education in Africa.* London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

Knowles, Malcolm. *Self-Directed Learning* (A Guide for Learners and Teachers). New York : Association Press, 1975.

Lerner, Daniel, and Schramm; Wilbur. *Communication and Change* *in the Developing Countries.* Honolulu, Hawaii : East-West Center Press, 1967.

MacKenzie, Norman; Postgale, R. ; and Scupham, John. *Open Learning.* Paris : The UNESCO Press, 1975.

"MOBRAL : "un modelo para la Education de Adultos ?" *Convergence,* Vol. VII, No. 1, 1974, pp. 61-70.

Perry, Walter. *The Open University (Early Development).* Report of the Vice-Chancellor, January 1969-December 1970, Bletchley, Buckinghamshire, England : The Open University Press, 1972.

Prest, A. R., and Turvey, R. "Cost-Benefit Analysis ; A Survey". *Economic Journal,* December, 1965, pp. 683-735.

Proceedings of the First Through Eleventh International Conferences of the International Council on Correspondence Education. 1938-1978.

Quade, E. S. *Cost-Effectiveness : An Introduction and Overview.* The Rand Corporation, 1965.

Remmers, H. H. ; Rivlin, Harry N. ; Ryans, David G. ; and Ryden, Einar R. *Growth, Teaching, and Learning* (A Book of Readings). New York, New York : Harpert Brothers Publishers, 1957.

Schramm. W.; Amagi, I.; Goto, K.; Hiralsuka, M.; and Kumagai, Y. "Japan's Broadcast-Correspondence High School". *New Educational Media in Action : Case Studies for Planners-I.* Paris ; UNESCO and IIEP, 1967.

Schramm, W.; Coombs, P, H.: Kuhnert, F.; and Lyle; J. *New Educational Media in Action : Case Studies for Planners* (3 Vols.). Paris; UNESCO, 1967.

Schramm, W.; Coombs, P. H.; Kuhnert, F.; and Lyle, J. *The New Media : Memo to Educational Planners.* Paris : UNESCO, 1967.

Schramm, W. "What the Research Says". *Quality in Instructional Television.* Edited by W. Schramm. Honolulu, Hawaii : University of Hawaii Press.

Snow, Richard E; "Research on Media and Aptitudes" in "Commentaries on Research in Instructional Media. An Examination of Conceptual Schemes". Edited by G. Salomon and R. E. Snow. *Viewpoints* (Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University), Vol. 46, No. 5, 1970, pp. 63-89.

Thias, Hans H., and Carnoy, Marlin. *Cost-Benefit Analysis in Education.* A Case Study in Kenya. Baltimore, Maryland/ London, England : Distribution by The Johns Hopkins Press, 1972.

Tickton, Sydney G., ed. *To Improve Learning, Vols. I and II.* (An Evaluation of Instructional Technology.) New York/London : R. R. Bowker, 1970.

Tickton, Sidney G., and Kohn, S. D. *The New Instructional Technology : Are They Worth It ?* Statement to the President's Commission on School Finance. Washington, D. C. : Academy for Educational Development, Inc., September, 1971.

Vaizey, John E., and Chesswass, J. D. *Casting Educational Plans,* Paris : UNESCO, 1967.

Vaizey, John. *Educational in the Modern World.* New York, New York : McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Ward, Ted. "Cognitive Processes and Learning ; Reflections on a Comparative Study of Cognitive Style". *Comparative Education Review,* Vol. 17, No. 1, Feb. 1973, pp, 1-9.

Wedemeyer, Charles A., ed. *The Brandenburg Memorial Essays on Correspondence Instruction,* Vol. 1. Madison, Wisconsin : The University of Wisconsin Extension, 1963.

Wedemeyer, Charles A., ed. *The Brandenburg Memorial Essays on Correspondence Instruction* Vol. II. Madison, Wisconsin : The University of Wisconsin Extension, 1966.

Wedemeyer, Charles A. "Independent Study." *Handbook of Contemporary Education.* New York, New York : Xerox Corporation and R. R. Bowker Company, 1975.

Wilkin, H. A, "A Cognitive Style Approach to Cross-Cultural Research." *International Journal of Psychology,* Vol. 2, No. 4, 1967, pp. 233-250.

Winn, William. "An Open System Model of Learning." *AV Communication Review,* Vol. 23, No. 1, Spring, 1975, pp. 5-33.

World Survey of Education V. Paris : UNESCO, 1971.

APPENDIX A

Terms of Reference, Definitions, and Methodology

Appendix A

Terms of Reference, Definitions, and Methodology

Terms of Reference. The basic purpose of the inquiry is to provide substantive information and data on both current and projected policies, principles, and practices in correspondence educating processes, from a worldwide perspective.

The general orientation of the inquiry is for both industrialized and less-industrialized nations, with the member nations of UNESCO in focus as the principal potential users.

The principal target audiences for the inquiry include (1) the top educational leaders responsible for overall policy decision-making on the inauguration of correspondence educating processes in a system, and (2) the professionals in a system responsible for administrative decision-making on the utilization of newer educational technology and techniques in their on-going programs.

Definitions. In the inquiry, "education" is treated as a subsystem of the society in which it exists.

The expression "educating processes" is used in the inquiry to connote formal or informal learning situations contrived intentionally to facilitate a person's efforts to acquire abilities, attitudes, and other forms of behavior of positive value in the society in which the person lives. The term "non-formal" refers to educating processes in which the learning situations are not contrived deliberately.

The phraseology "correspondence educating processes" is used in the inquiry to identify the unique set of teaching-learning strategies employed when the learner is at a geographical distance from the teacher in the educating processes of a system. This phraseology is used in preference to other widely used terms; since it denotes the separation of the learner from the teacher, it integrates correspondence with mainstream educating processes, and it connotes the dynamic, as opposed to the static, qualities involved.

The concept of "becoming educated" is treated in the inquiry in the dynamic sense as the lifelong efforts of a person to learn, with the means of learning only incidental to the ends in view.

Methodology. The basic methodology for gathering information and data for the inquiry included, among other things : (1) making a critical review of the literature relevant to the subject; (2) utilizing techniques for gathering information and data from an extremely wide range of sources; and (3) conducting fact-finding interviews in as many different educating systems as practicable within the constraints of time and resources. In view of the purpose and nature of the inquiry, the basic methodology did not include research methods used normally in the concept of "survey research", which involves the making and testing for significance of hypotheses through the use of statistical and other experimental techniques.

On the basis of a critical review of selected, relevant literature available in the English language, a bibliography of 413 references was developed for the inquiry. This bibliography includes references to relevant educating processes in general, as well as references pertaining directly to correspondence educating processes per se. Fortunately, many of the references, although in English, were prepared initially by professionals in systems where the native language is not English. This assures, at least to some extent, that nations other than the English-speaking ones are represented in the bibliography.

A lengthy, comprehensive questionnaire was developed (Appendix G) as one means of gathering information and data on current and projected policies, principles, and practices in correspondence educating systems worldwide. With necessary provisions to avoid duplication, questionnaires were distributed to a representative number of membership schools of each of the organizations listed below.

The International Council on Correspondence Education (ICCE).

The European Home Study Council (EHSC).

The European Council for Education by Correspondence (CEC).

The African Association for Correspondence Education (AACE).

The National University Extension Association-Independent Study Division (NUEA).

The Australian South Pacific External Studies Association (ASPESA).

The Canadian Association of Departments of Extension and Summer Schools (CADESS).

The National Home Study Council (NHSC).

The Japan Council on Correspondence Education (JCCE).

For schools in China, and in Russia and other Eastern European nations, questionnaires were distributed to the respective Ministries of Education with the request that the questionnaires be completed by the institutions most eligible to reply and then returned to us.

In addition to the above, questionnaires were distributed to other selected schools in Malaysia, South Africa, and South America (see Appendix B).

As another means of gathering information and data, both on-site and off-site interviews were conducted with professionals and others. Because of limitations of resources for travel, on-site fact-finding visitations were principally in Europe and in the United States. The off-site interviews were accomplished primarily through attendance at educational conferences involving international representation, and through on-campus relations at the University of Wisconsin. Wherever feasible to do so, tape recording techniques were used for interviews.

As a final means of gathering information and data, indepth, face to-face discussions were held with a selected few leaders from widely scattered places around the world where correspondence educating systems have made significant impacts, as well as where they have not. These indepth discussions were planned and designed not so much for specific fact-finding purposes, as were the interviews, but were intended to obtain broadly-based insights and knowledges on some of the overall aspects or factors affecting correspondence educating processes in differentiated socio-economic-political contexts.

APPENIX B

Numerical Information and Data on the Distribution of and Response to the Questionnaire

Appendix B

Numerical Information and Data on the Distribution of and Response to the Questionnaire

Distribution of the Questionnaire. The approximate number of questionnaires distributed is shown below for each nation or continent, as the case may be, except for China and Russia, from which nations no replies of any kind were ever received.

Nation or Continent	Approximate Number of Questionnaires Distributed
Africa	40
Australia	16
Austria	3
Belgium	4
Canada	36
Ceylon	1
Denmark	3
England	17
Fiji Islands	1
Finland	4
France	6
Germany	14
Hong Kong	3
India	5
Ireland	2
Israel	3
Italy	2
Japan	1
Lebanon	2
Malaysia	1
Mexico	3
Netherlands	4
New Guinea	1
New Zealand	2
Norway	5
Poland	2
Portugal	2
Singapore	1
South Africa	2
South America	9
Spain	5
Sweden	6
Switzerland	4
Turkey	1
U. S. A.	96
West Indies	1
Yugoslavia	3
TOTAL :	313

Responses to the Questionnaire. In all, there were 105 responses of one kind or another to the approximately 313 questionnaires distributed. In a very few cases (6 in all), the questionnaire package was refused, or was unclaimed, and was returned unopened. Of the total responses received, 63 questionnaires contained enough information and data in one or another of the categories of the questionaire to be usable for the inquiry. The 63 institutions from which the completed or, in some cases, partially completed questionnaires were received are listed below.

RESPONDENTS

(Selected for Use in this Report)

Chinese University of Hong Kong
Department of Extramural Studies
Kowloon, Hong Kong, China

Institute of Public Affairs
Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

Universidad LaSalle de Sud America (ULSA)
Villa Ballester, Provincia de Buenos Aires
Republica Argentina, Sud America

Escuela Bancariay Commercial
Col. Juarez, Mexico, D. F.

Correspondence Course Unit
Luanshya, Republic of Zambia, Africa

Correspondence Institute, Co-operative
Education Center
Moshi, Tanzania, Africa

Addis Ababa University
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Africa

Lesotho Distance Teaching Centre
Maseru, Lesotho, Africa

Institut African pour le Development
Economique et Social (INADES)
Dapango (Togo), Africa

Brevskoleradet

Oslo, Norway

Hamburger Fern-Lehrinstitut (HFL)
Hamburg, West Germany

Kansanvalistusseran Kirjeopisto
(The Correspondence Institute of the Society
for Popular Culture)
Helsinki, Finland

Hamburger Fern-Lehrinstitut (HFL)
Vienna, Austria

Centre National de Tele-Enseignement (CNTE)
Vanves, France

Fernuniversitat
Hagen, Northrhine-Westphalia, West Germany

Maturaschule Dr. Roland
Vienna, Austria

Norsk Korrespondanse Skole (NKS)
Oslo, Norway

Koninklijke PBNA B.V.
Arnhem, The Netherlands

The University of Queensland
Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

The Correspondence School
Department of Education
Wellington, New Zealand

Adelaide College of Advanced Education
External Studies Department
Adelaide, South Australia, Australia

The University of New England
Armidale, New South Wales, Australia

University of New South Wales
Division of Postgraduate Extension Studies
Kensington, New South Wales, Australia

Home Study Institute

Washington, D. C., U.S.A.

International Correspondence Schools
Scranton, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.

American School
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

McGraw-Hill Continuing Education Center
Washington, D. C., U.S.A.

Punjabi University
Directorate of Correspondence Courses
Patiala, Punjab, India

Stamford College
Correspondence Education Division
Singapore 1, Singapore

University of Papua New Guinea
National Capital District
Papua New Guinea

United States Air Force
Extension Course Institute
Montgomery, Alabama, U.S.A.

University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa, U.S.A.

University of Idaho
Correspondence Study Office
Moscow, Idaho, U.S.A.

University of North Carolina
Independent Study by Extension
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, U.S.A.

University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada, U.S.A.

University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma, U.S.A.

Bureau of Adult Services
Massachusetts Department of Education

Boston, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa, U.S.A.

University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, Mississippi, U.S.A.

University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota, U.S.A.

Southern Methodist University
Correspondence Division
Dallas, Texas, U.S.A.

The University of New Mexico
Division of Continuing Education and
Community Services
Albuquerque, New Mexico, U.S.A.

University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona, U.S.A.

The University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi, U.S.A.

Loyola University
Correspondence Study Division
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

The University of Wisconsin (Madison)
Independent Study
Madison, Wisconsin, U.S.A.

The University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado, U.S.A.

Division of Independent Study
State University Station
Fargo, North Dakota, U.S.A.

University of California Extension
Independent Study
Berkeley, California, U.S.A.

The Pennsylvania State University

Department of Independent by Correspondence
University Park, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.

University of Georgia
Extension Credit Programs
Athens, Georgia, U.S.A.

Indiana University
Independent Study Division
Bloomington, Indiana, U.S.A.

The University of Wyoming
Department of Correspondence Study
Laramie, Wyoming, U.S.A.

University of Utah
Correspondence Study Department
Salt Lake City, Utah, U.S.A.

University of Missouri
Center for Independent Study
Columbia, Missouri, U.S.A.

The University of Tennessee
Center for Extended Learning-Independent Study
Knoxville, Tennessee, U.S.A.

The University of Texas
Extension Teaching and Field Service Bureau
Austin, Texas, U.S.A.

The University of Minnesota
Department of Independent Study
Minneapolis, Minnesota, U.S.A.

California State University
Continuing Education and Innovative Programs
Los Angeles. California, U.S.A.

College of External Studies
Port Moresky
Papua New Guinea

Beirut ARAB University
Beirut, Lebanon

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire for the Inquiry

# BASIC QUESTIONNAIRE
for the
UNESCO-ICCE STUDIES
on
CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION SYSTEMS
(A worldwide Survey)

****

A. Name of Institution or Organization ________________________

____

B. Address ____________________________________

____

C. City, State (or Province, Republic, or other) and Nation ________

____

____

D. Name and Title of Respondent ________________________

____

****

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION (ICCE)

under contract with the

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATION, CULTURAL, AND SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATION (UNESCO)

ABOUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is concerned primarily with policy-making and decision-making processes for correspondence education systems. The central purpose of the questionnaire is to obtain as complete and accurate information and data as possible to aid in the preparation of two studies on correspondence education. The studies are being prepared by the International Council on Correspondence Education (ICCE) for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

We hereby solicit your active participation and assistance in the preparation of these two studies. You can participate and assist by supplying answers to the questions in this questionnaire for your correspondence education system.

What are the two studies.? One study focuses on the practices and principles of correspondence education in the world today, and is directed to authorities with decision-making powers who may wish to provide correspondence education opportunities in their own education systems. The second study concentrates on trends and new developments in correspondence education. With particular reference to the newer communications technologies. This second study is directed to a larger audience of educators with primary responsiblities for operating correspondence education programs.

Why these studies? It is projected that the findings of these studies could aid in providing a framework from which certain of the less-industrialized nations would formulate their own policies and procedures for the introduction of correspondence education in their larger systems of education.

How are the questions to be answered? Because of the purpose and nature of this project, the questions in the questionnaire provide opportunity for you to respond in two ways : You may respond by simply placing a check mark in the 'Yes' or 'No' spaces provided throughout the questionnaire, and/or you may respond in your own words wherever appropiate for your correspondence education system. In practically all cases where your response is 'Yes', opportunity is provided for you to comment further.

What about terminology for a project of this scope? Because of the world-wide scope of this project, the terminology is as universal as possible. The expression 'your correspondence education system' is employed throughout the questionnaire to mean any national, regional, provincial, state, local, organizational, institutional, or other public or private system of correspondence education for which you are responding. Your system may be integral to a larger system, or it may exist as a separate organization or institution.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this project.

Ripley S. Sims
Research Associate
ICCE-UNESCO Project

BACKGROUND ON STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT

The purpose of this section is to obtain background information on the phases or stages of growth and development of your correspondence education system.

1. Basic Question : What were the stages of initiation, growth, and development of your correspondence education system? Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces of the subsections to this question. The reverse side of this sheet or another sheet may be used for your comments.

a. Were there any major social, economic, geographic, demographic, educational or other factors that influenced or gave rise to your correspondence education system? Yes.........No......... (If Yes, Please describe the factors.)

b. Were there initial limitations such as function or role, size, finance, educational level, etc, placed on your correspondence education system? Yes.........No.......... (If Yes, please discuss the *principal* initial limitations or constraints.)

c. In the subsequent phases of development of your systems, were the initial limitations or constraints changed or removed? Yes.........No.......... (If Yes, what were the principal contributing factors for the changes?)

d. Were there other clearly identifiable phases or stages of growth and development in the development of your correspondence education system? Yes.........No.......... (If Yes, what were the stages *in outline*, up to and including your status today?)

e. If you were to begin today to plan, organize, and operate your correspondence education system, what *major* changes would you make, and why? (Please be as definitive as possible.)

POLICY-MAKING PROCESS

The purpose of this section is to obtain information on the policy-making process of your correspondence education system.

2. Basic Question : What is the policy-making machinery for your correspondence education system ? Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces of the subsections to this question. The reverse side of this sheet or another sheet may be used for your comments.

a. Do you have a legal basis, or a legislative act or provision, for your correspondence education system ? Yes......... No.......... (If yes, please cite and discuss the basis or provision.)

b. Is your correspondence education system a public (governmental) or private (non-governmental) system ? It is a public system......It is a private system......other....... (If Other, please specify, such as : private, proprietary.)

c. Does an interrelationship exist between your 'public' correspondence education system and a counterpart 'private' system ? Yes.........No.......... (If yes, please explain the interrelationship,) Please answer either c or d.

d. Does an interrelationship exist between your 'private' correspondence education system and a counterpart 'public' system ? Yes.........No.......... (If Yes, please explain the interrelationship.) Please answer either c or d.

e. Is the policy-making machinery for your system related to or integrated with the policy-making machinery of a larger system of education ? Yes.........No.......... (If Yes, what is that system, and how does the policy-making machinery function ?)

f. Is there a person or group of persons in your correspondence education system with prime duty to advise and/or formulate recommendations to policy-making bodies for correspondence education ? Yes.........No....... (If Yes, please give the title or titles of the person or persons involved and describe how they function.)

g. Are there provisions for formally organized consultation among persons in correspondence education for policy-making decisions on correspondence education ? Yes.........No.......... (If Yes, please explain when and how this consultation is carried on.)

h. Do you have clear, unambiguous over-all policy statements on the functions of correspondence education, and on the services to be provided ? Yes.........No.......... (If Yes, please describe the policy or attach a copy of the statements.)

i. How would you summarize any changes you anticipate in the policy-making machinery of your correspondence education system ? (Please be as definitive as possible.)

PLANNING PROCESS

The purpose of this section is to obtain information on the planning process for your correspondence education system.

3 Basic Question : How do you go about planning your correspondence education system ? Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces of the subsections to this question. The reverse side of this sheet or another sheet may be used for your comments.

a. Do you have a working guide or handbook for initiating and following-through on your correspondence education planning ? Yes.........No.......... (If Yes, please describe or attach a copy. If No, please describe how planning is accomplished.)

b. Does your correspondence education planning include both quantitative aspects (educational facilities based on demographic, economic and other factors) and qualitative aspects (educational aims and content, teacher qualifications, research and other factors) ? Yes......... No.......... (If Yes, please give examples.)

c. Is your correspondence education planning a continuous process, running from the diagnosis and assessment of present needs through formulation and implementation of plans to meet the needs to evaluation and revision as required by experience ? Yes.........No.......... (If Yes, please cite and discuss examples.)

d. Does your correspondence education planning include the participation of people with different kinds of backgrounds and orientations : teachers, parents, students, lay citizens, and others ? Yes.........No.......... (If Yes, please give examples of participants and discuss their function.)

e. In following-through on your correspondence education planning, do you establish an order of priority among different categories and concentrate your efforts on those categories most desirable for your system ? Yes......No...... (If Yes, please summarize your current planning priorities for the categories listed below-which comes first, second, third, etc., and indicate reasons for priority rankings.)
......Changing needs of society
......Changing needs of students
......Future flows of students
......Recruitment and/or training of teachers
......Newer communications technologies
......New developments in correspondence education
......Research and evaluation
......Others (specify)

Planning Process continued

f. How would you describe any changes you anticipate in planning your correspondence education system ? (Please be as definitive as possible.)

ORGANIZATION OF CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION

The purpose of this section is to obtain information on the organization of your correspondence education system.

4. Basic Question : What is the organization structure of your correspondence education system ? Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces of the subsections to this question. The reverse side of this sheet or another sheet may be used for your comments.

a. Is the *organization* of your correspondence education system integrated with the organization structure of a larger system of education ? Yes.........No........ (If Yes, what is that larger system ? If practicable, please provide a chart showing place of correspondence education in the over-all organization.)

b. Do you have a chart showing the organization structure of your correspondence education system ? Yes........No....... (If Yes, please attach a copy of the *correspondence education* organization chart.)

c. How would you state the basic rationale for the present organization structure of your correspondence education system ? (Please be as definitive as possible.)

d. How would you describe any changes you anticipate in the organization of your correspondence education system ? (Please be as definitive as possible.)

OPERATIONAL PROCESSES

The purpose of this section is to obtain information on the operational processes of your correspondence education system.

5. **Basic Question :** **What are the operational processes of your correspondence education system ? Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces of the subsections to this question. The reverse side of this sheet or another sheet may be used for your comments.**

a. Do you have working guidelines for the operation of your correspondence education system ? Yes.........No......... (If Yes, please attach a copy. If No, please explain your operation procedures.)

b. Is the *operation* of your correspondence education system related to or integrated with a larger system of education ? Yes.........No......... (If Yes, please explain how.)

c. Do you follow a clearly outlined sequence of steps in your decision-making process on what services to provide in your correspondence education system ? Yes.........No......... (If Yes, please describe the steps and list the services you provide.)

d. Are there identifiable factors that influence or determine the forms of correspondence education (individual study, supervised correspondence study, group correspondence study, etc.) you have in your system ? Yes.........No......... (If Yes, please name the factors and state the forms you use.)

e. Does the vertical structure of your correspondence education program deviate significantly from the usual primary, secondary, technical, or tertiary vertical programs of 'conventional' education systems ? Yes.........No......... (If yes, please explain how.)

f. Do you have criteria specially designed for the recruitment and/or training of teaching and technical staff for your correspondence education system ? Yes.........No.........

(If Yes, please discuss and/or attach a copy of the criteria. If No, how do you recruit staffs ?)

g. Do you have procedures for following-through to assess the clearness, accuracy, and understandability of the instructional materials supplied to the students in your correspondence education systems ? Yes.........No......... (If Yes, please describe or attach a copy of the procedures.)

h. How would you summarize any changes you anticipate in operation of your correspondence education system ? (Please be as definitive as possible.)

CERTIFICATION AND ACCREDITATION POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The purpose of this section is to obtain information on the certification, accreditation, and credit-granting policies and practices of and with respect to your correspondence education system.

6. Basic Question ; What are the certification, accreditation, and credit-granting policies and practices of and with respect to your system ? Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces of the subsections to this question. The reverse side of this sheet or another sheet may be used for your .comments.

a. Are the academic and/or technical subjects offered in your system designed to be comparable to the same subjects in the 'conventional' education system ? Yes.........No......... (If No, please explain the function of your system.)

b. Does your correspondence education system meet or exceed certain criteria, standards, and procedural requirements as pre-determined by an authorized accrediting government or other agency ? Yes.........No......... (If Yes, what is that agency ? If No, please describe criteria and standards you use.)

c. Is the *accreditation* of your system integral with, or separate from, the accreditation of a larger education system ? It is integral with a larger system.........; it is separate from any larger system......... (If integral, what is the larger system and now is accreditation carried out.

d. Are the teachers in your correspondence education system required to meet teacher certification standards applicable to 'conventional' teaching staffs ? Yes.........No......... Not required......... (If not required, please explain.)

e. Are your correspondence education students required to meet admission standards applicable to 'conventional' students taking the same or comparable courses or subjects ? Yes.........No......... Not required......... (If not required, please explain.)

f. Do correspondence and 'conventional' students receive the same academic recognition (credit, award, graduation, etc.) for comparable work completed? Yes.........No.......... (If No, why not?)

g. How would you describe the transferability of credits between your system and other credit-granting institutions and/or organizations? (please be as definitive as possible.)

h. How would you summarize any changes you anticipate in the certification and accreditation policies and practices of your correspondence education system? (please be as definitive as possible.)

UTILIZATION OF NEWER COMMUNICATIODS TECHNOLOGIFS

The purpose of this section is to obtain information on your use of communications technologies in your correspondence education system.

7. Basic Question : What communications technologies do you use in your correspondence education system and with what justification ? Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces of the subsections to this question. The reverse side of this sheet or another sheet may be used for your comments.

a. Do you have working guidelines governing the use of communications technologies in your correspondence education system ? Yes......... No....... (If Yes, Please describe or attach a copy.)

b. Do you use any of the following communications technologies in your correspondence education system ? Yes......... No....... . (If Yes, place a check mark next to each one you use and add others as needed. Please state primary reason for use in each case.)

......Slides
......Films
......Tapes
......Cassettes
......Telephones
......Radio
......Radiovision
......Television
......Language Laboratories
......Computers
......Satetllites
......Others (specify)

c. Do you have access to research information and data for your decision-making process on what communications technologies are most effective for specified or defined purposes in correspondence education ? Yes......No....... (If Yes, please discuss and cite source or sources. If No, how do you decide on what communications technologies to use ?)

d. Do you have access to research information and data on what communications technologies are most effective in terms of the interst' effort' and progress of correspondence edcation students in any of the following categories : in-school youth, out-of-school youth, working adults, non-working adults, others (specify) ? Yes...... No....... (If Yes, please discuss and cite source or sources.)

e. Are your communications technologies planned integrals of your system, or are they *not* planned integrals but are superimposed on your on-going correspondence education process ? They are planned integrals......; they are not planned integrals......; they are some of both... ... (If planned integrals, please discuss with examples.)

f. How would you summarize any changes you anticipate in the utilization of communications technologies in your correspondence education system ? (Please be as definitive as possible.)

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The purpose of this section is to obtain information on your research and evaluation activities in your correspondence education system.

8. Basic Question : What are the principal research and evaluation activities in your correspondence education system ? Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces of the subsections to this question. The reverse side of this sheet or another sheet may be used for your comments.

a. Do you have working guidelines which require continuing or periodic research activities in your correspondence education system ? Yes......No....... (If Yes, please explain or attach a copy of the quidelines.)

b, Do your research activities result in information and data which aid in the improvement of teaching-learning materials in correspondence education ? Yes......No....... (If Yes, please discuss with examples.)

c. Do your research activities make contributions to the knowledge on different learning styles and abilities among the students in correspondence education ? Yes......No...... (If Yes, please discuss, with examples.)

d. Do your research activities seek answers to the 'What if . . .' or experimental types of questions in correspondence education ? Yes......No...... . (If Yes, please diseuss with examples, and state your findings and conclusions.

e. Is any of your research activity directed toward the development of theory on the correspondence education process ? Yes......No...... . (If Yes with what results ?)

f. Do you have working arrangements for the continuing or periodic over-all evaluation of your correspondence education system ? Continuing evaluation......; periodic evaluation......;

no over-all evaluation...... . (If continuing or periodic evaluation, please describe the arrangements.)

g. Do you have a written statement on the over-all objectives of the systematic evaluation of your correspondence education system ? Yes......No...... . (If Yes, please discuss and/or attach a copy of your statement of objectives.)

h, How would you summarize any changes you anticipate in the research and evaluation activities in your correspondence education system ? (Please be as definitive as possible.)

TRENDS AND NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION

The purpose of this section is to obtain information on the trends and new developments in your correspondence education system.

9. Basic Question : What are the trends and new developments in your correspondence education system ? Please place a check mark in the appropriate spaces of the subsections to this question. The reverse side of this sheet or another sheet may be used for your comments.

a. Is there any trend toward a new or changing function or role for your correspondence education system ? Yes.........No......... (If Yes, what is it ?)

b. Are there trends or new developments in the 'conventional' education system with definite impact on your correspondence education system ? Yes......No......, (If Yes, please describe these trends and developments and discuss their impact on your correspondence education system.)

c. Have you developed new designs or techniques which improve the effectiveness and/or efficiency of instructional activities in your correspondence education system ? Yes......No....... (If Yes, please discuss with examples.)

d. Is there a trend to integrate newer communications technologies in your correspondence education system ? Yes.........No.......... (If Yes, please explain how.)

e. Is there a trend to increase the availability of research-based knowledge as a guide for the design of teaching-learning materials in correspondence education ? Yes.........No.......... (If Yes, please discuss with examples.)

f. Is there a trend to accelerate the complete acceptance, wherever needed, of your correspondence education system as an integral in the 'conventional' or traditional education system ? Yes......No.........Not needed.......... (If No or Not needed, please explain.)

g. How would you summarize the trends and new developments you anticipate in your correspondence education system ? (Please be as definitive as possible.)

COST OF CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION

The purpose of this section is to obtain information on your CAPITAL COSTS, your RECURRENT COSTS, and on the COSTS of the COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES used in your correspondence education system.

10. Basic Question : What are the *annual* CAPITAL costs of your correspondence education system ? Please use *Chart One* to answer this question. Record in the spaces provided the amount (in your currency) and sources of money spent for your capital costs items.

11. Basic Question : What are the *annual* RECURRENT costs of your correspondence education system ? Please use *Chart Two* to answer this question. Record in the spaces provided the amount (in your currency) and sources of money spent for your recurring costs items.

12. Basic Question : What are the *annual* costs of the COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES currently in use in your system ? Please use *Chart Three* to answer this question, Record in the spaces provided the amount (in your currency) and sources of money spent for your communications technologies.

Chart One

CAPITAL COSTS* FOR CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION

CAPITAL COSTS ITEMS	Costs Borne by Central Authority	Costs Borne by State or Province	Costs Borne by City or Other Local Sources	Costs Borne by Students	Costs Borne by Foreign Aid
Purchase and Development of Land					
Buildings, Classrooms, and Laboratories					
Mobile and/or Fixed Instructional Equipment					
Other Capital Costs (specify)					

*Please identify your currency.

Chart Two

RECURRENT COSTS* FOR CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION

RECURRENT COSTS ITEMS	Costs Borne by Central Authority	Costs Borne by State or Province	Costs Borne by City or Other Local Sources	Costs Borne by Students	Costs Borne by Foreign Aid
Salaries for Teaching and Non-Teaching Staffs					
Student Services (advisory, lessons, assignments, and/or guidance)					
Administration					
Textbook Materials from Publishers (shelf stock)					
Authors and Editors					
Printing of Specially Prepared Textbook and Syllabi Materials					
Postage					
Promotion and/or Marketing					
Other (specify)					

*Please identify your currency.

Chart Three

COST* INFORMATION ON COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES FOR CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION

COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES	Cost of Technical Production		Cost of Transmission and Distribution		Cost of Reception (where applicable)		Costs Borne by Central Authority	Costs Borne by State or Local Gov't.	Costs Borne by Foreign Aid	Costs Borne by Students
	Fixed Costs	Variable Costs	Fixed Costs	Variable Costs	Fixed Costs	Variable Costs				
Slides										
Films										
Tapes										
Cassettes										
Telephone										
Radio										
Radiovision										
Television										
Computers										
Satellites										
Other (specify)										

*Please identify your currency.

SUPPLEMENTS

Please supply one copy each of printed or mimeographed materials pertinent to the purposes of this project and which supplement your responses to the questions.

Please include also statistical information and data on current enrollments, completions, etc., in the correspondence education system for which you are responding.

Thank you very much for your active participation in this world-wide survey.